

# FAITH AND FREEDOM



A JOURNAL OF  
PROGRESSIVE RELIGION

LIBRARY  
STARR KING SCHOOL  
NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM BUILDING

Volume 12  
Part 3

SUMMER  
1959

Number  
36

# FAITH AND FREEDOM

A JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RELIGION

Editor: E. SHIRVELL PRICE, M.A.

Assistant Editor: A. K. ROSS, B.C.L., M.A.

Associate Editor: CHARLES W. PHILLIPS, A.M., B.D.

VOL. 12, PART 3

SUMMER 1959

NUMBER 36

## BUT IS IT RELIGION?

STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN .. .. . 97

## THE WILL TO MAKE-BELIEVE

DAVID LINDSEY WATSON .. .. . 105

## UNIVERSALISM IN ENGLISH LITURGIOLOGY

ALEC E. PEASTON .. .. . 110

## A DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT FOR THE MODERN WORLD

F. J. HAMBLIN .. .. . 115

## THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

C. H. BARTLETT .. .. . 129

## A REVIEW OF CLOSED RANKS ..

PAUL E. KILLINGER .. .. . 143



LAUNCHED AT THE INSTANCE OF THE OLD  
STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION OF MANCHESTER  
COLLEGE, OXFORD, WITH THE FINANCIAL  
SUPPORT OF THE DR. DANIEL JONES TRUST  
PUBLISHED AT  
MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD, ENGLAND

Editorial and Subscriptions at 13 Shrewsbury Road, Bolton, Lancs.

**Sterling Area** Annual Subscription 7/6. Single Copies 2/6,  
by post 2/10. Remit to Editor at above address.

**Dollar Area** Annual Subscription \$1.50 Single Copies 50c

U.S.A. Remit to R. RAIBLE, 4015, Normandy, Dallas,  
5, Texas, U.S.A.

Canada. Remit to R. McDONALD, 456 Argyle Avenue,  
Westmount, P.Q., Canada.

# *But is it Religion?*

*Comments on Questions often asked of Unitarians\**

STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN

“ We had fed the heart on fantasies,  
The heart's grown brutal from the fare;  
More substance in our enmities  
Than in our love.”

W. B. YEATS

*The Stare's Nest by My Window*

THIS address would be of a far higher temperature if I allowed myself to say all that might be said. I could quote Dr. Oscar Riddle of Illinois on the schizoid nature of American intellectual life today which is due to the needless and absurd maintenance of religious views that became archaic a century ago upon the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. Our loitering scholarship in technology, engineering and the social sciences, dramatized by contrast with great advances in other lands, Dr. Riddle attributes to a powerful religious conditioning in this country by Protestant and Catholic alike. The cost of maintaining outmoded religious views is very practical and political in nature. If we feed our minds and our culture on out-moded religious ideas we must expect malnourishment to exact its price.

There are moments in a minister's life when he feels a compulsion to flee to the desert and never write another sermon or conduct another service of religion. I had such an impulse last Sunday afternoon after watching a group of clergymen on television. It was a program, "The Press and the Clergy" conducted by Dr. Clifton Moore for the Presbytery of Southern California. A group of Christian ministers and one Unitarian, Rev. Richard Seebode of the new Torrance Church, discussed whether Christianity was an exclusive religion, the one way, truth and light for mankind. I was appalled, shocked, and depressed at the exhibition of orthodox Christian dogmatism, arrogance and smugness of these men (except for Mr. Seebode and Dr. Moore). The impact of the present wave of neo-orthodoxy struck me like cold water in the face. Dr. Moore, at the end of the program, felt compelled to ask one of the participants whether he didn't think the program had conveyed a certain impression of fanaticism which possibly should be corrected before they went off the air. The men asked to comment didn't seem to think so.

If it hadn't been for the old-fashioned Fosdick-type Christian liberalism of Dr. Moore and the quiet sanity and gentle humor of Dick Seebode, the Unitarian, who entered the den and faced down

\*An Address delivered at the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles on a Sunday in February 1959.



the lions like the brave Daniel he is, I might be on the desert now building a shack on some government land, and starting that book I want to write. But here I am, for better or worse . . . and I propose to offer another polemic, a frankly definition-centered sermon on religion. It was planned many weeks ago, to say some things which are to me of elementary and great importance. I have often had the question put to me: "Mr. Fritchman, I approve of most of what goes on at this Church. I support it morally and financially. I come, and I defend what transpires here against its detractors. But I really wonder, is it religion? It doesn't resemble very much what most people think of as religion." So I think it is high time we grapple with this question. My premise this morning is based on a quotation. Julian Huxley in his exciting book, *Religion Without Revelation*, says: "Let us start with the idea of religion as an organ of destiny. Twentieth century man needs a new organ for dealing with destiny, a new system of beliefs and attitudes adapted to the situation in which he and his societies now have to exist, and thus an organ for the better orientation of the human species as a whole—in other words a new religion."

I believe this too. Every arts festival, every lecture on science, every Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice resolution and petition, every musical concert, every session of personal counselling, every Tuckerman Guild project for aid to our fellow men, every sermon, every seminar on ethics, every church school class, every battle against loyalty oaths—everything we deliberately do here is related to Dr. Huxley's affirmation, and mine, that this is religion. Let us see why I say this. Let us, with some self-searching of mind, see how rigid how dogmatic, how burdened with inherited and outmoded concepts of religion many of us are. Above all else, let us divest ourselves of a closed mind when we use this word "religion". It is a broad term. Many of us are in danger of dismissing religion if it doesn't bear the familiar hallmarks of household familiarity, if it lacks the worn garments of childhood memories, if it is not at home in the church or temple or hearthside we knew at the age of eight or ten. Even some very brilliant and mature people are fantastically provincial about this word religion. Their science and politics have matured; their religion never got out of the crib and playpen. So they banish the word entirely. Please do not think me unsympathetic today with the temper that makes one say in revolt: "religion is a sham", or "religion is a superstition", or "religion is a terrible piece of egotistical dogmatism". I know the impulse. That urbane, usually self-controlled Victorian poet I admire so much, Matthew Arnold, once burst out in a poem called *Obermann* with a verse of fire:

"Your creeds are dead, your rites are dead,  
Your social order too.  
Where tarries he, the Power who said:  
'See, I make all things new'?"

After all, I admitted earlier that I almost fled both the city and the ministry last Sunday. I know how Matthew Arnold felt, and how many of you feel. But my polemic today requires that you and I tarry and take a second look.

First, some words about definitions. Religion is a term in the common coinage of speech that gets away with murder. We fail to examine the word because so much in our culture urges us to take it for granted that the word is generally understood. Ninety-five per cent of America, Mr. Gallup told us a few years ago, believes in God. As I reported last Sunday, 105 million people now belong to American temples and churches. Most of these folk would say they "know" that religion is belief in God, belief in their creed and faithful performance of certain actions of ritual and ceremonial, so why argue?

Since Unitarians like lectures, Unitarians would begin with a different gambit: the etymological. I have done so myself. Where does the word come from? What is its origin? Let's look at the Latin. The dictionary says the word comes from "religare" which means "To be bound", or from "relegere" meaning "gather together". But to worship at the shrine of early meanings is far from satisfactory for modern man.

Unitarians, and other liberals, often define religion as an intellectual assertion, a belief in God, for example; and thus make the mistake of suggesting that religion is primarily an intellectual exercise, an affirmation, a syllogism. Others will say that religion is a feeling, an emotional sense of dependence on a power not ourselves. This was the proposal of the 19th century German theologian, Schleiermacher, and many folk who never heard of Schleiermacher think this way about religion. Others will say religion is the performance of an act, the taking of the eucharist, or the helping of a wounded man on the road to Jericho or the defense of the Bill of Rights, thus equating religion with an act one thinks to be good. In recent years it has become popular to define religion as a sense of wonder and awe before the mystery of life, what Rudolph Otto called "the numinous", the sense of the holy. The neo-orthodox Christians led by Karl Barth in this century, have developed this concept of religion as the wholly other, the indefinable, that which man cannot comprehend.

We could offer many more definitions, but let me turn to the *Encyclopedia of Religion* edited by Professor Vergilius Ferm of the Department of Philosophy at Wooster College, a good Presbyterian institution. I mention this, to point out that this definition is no Unitarian special pleading. Dr. Ferm writes: "A definition of religion may well need to include extreme humanists, extreme mystics, extreme pantheists, devotees of nature, Utopian enthusiasts, agnostics and avowed atheists." He then makes this definition: "To be religious is in effect, in some way, and in some measure, a vital adjustment, however tentative and incomplete, to whatever is



reacted to, or regarded implicitly or explicitly as worthy of serious and ulterior concern." Broad, yes—it must be to encompass the facts. The rest of my comments this morning will take that definition from Professor Ferm as a working tool. First, this definition possesses the merit of intellectual honesty. Dr. Ferm is saying what Julian Huxley, a humanist, is saying in other words (though I remind you that Dr. Ferm is probably a devout Presbyterian). Dr. Huxley says: "Man is always concerned about his destiny, his position and role in the universe. Men develop organs for orienting their ideas and emotions and for constructing patterns of belief and behavior in relation to their conception of their destiny. They are all, from Haitian voodoo to Roman Catholics, from neolithic fertility religions to Marxist Communism, concerned with the same general function."

And he might well have added—from Boston Channing Unitarianism to Los Angeles First Church Unitarianism, whatever the gulf, small or great. Dr. Ferm, Dr. Huxley and your minister this morning are not being vague, but as specific as language can make possible without leaving out what belongs in an inclusive definition of religion.

One of the most helpful persons to me in thinking about this matter of defining religion is Dr. Herbert J. Muller, author of that priceless book: *Uses of the Past: Profiles of Former Societies*. "Religion", he reminds us, "serves a rational and emotional purpose in trying to make sense of the world . . . from animistic myth to metaphysics and philosophy. It deals with questions science does not answer, or even raise. Science deals with how things happen; it does not explain why things are, or why they are as bad as they often seem." Dr. Muller adds: "Science explains the immediate causes of suffering and death, but not the pathos of mortality, the reasons why man must suffer and die. Men have to come to terms with what they know and what they don't know. They have to accept the universe, whether it be the Universe of Einstein or Augustine."

It was George Santayana who wisely said: "The idea that religion contains a literal, not a symbolical representation of truth and life is simply an impossible idea." (Of course it was this insistence last Sunday on the TV show I mentioned, that Christianity does give a literal representation of truth, that distressed me so much. I found it hard to believe than in 1959 A.D. in the age of the solar sputnik and textual criticism, several presentable, educated men could hold such views.)

Dr. Muller, Mr. Santayana and Dr. Huxley are men who assert that religion offers symbolic representations of truth, naturally conditioned by time and space, and by the limitations of the human mind. This does not invalidate religion as a process of thought and activity. Even the wide testimony of mystics over the centuries, who claim the most immediate knowledge of God, proves only the power of their belief, not its validity. We do not take the quality or intensity of an exalted experience as proof of its objective truth.

I am today asserting the great importance of using in religious activity all of our faculties of mind, moral conviction, dedication of energies, to fulfilling our powers to the greatest degree. This includes keeping our mental integrity at all times, even as we confess how much around us is mystery and how many questions may never be answered. I like to remind myself of the words of John Stuart Mill, writing in the days of the Victorian Christian dogmatists who preached about a violent and arbitrary God to the people of England: "Whatever power such a being may have over me, there is one thing he shall not do; he shall not compel me to worship him. I will call no being good who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow creatures; and if such a being can sentence me to hell for not so calling him, to hell I will go."

To me that was a great religious declaration, and should give us all a sense of gratitude for John Stuart Mill. The rational approach to religion, such as he was demonstrating, offers a symbolic representation of the ideal, not a literal statement of the actual. It restores a feeling of richness that we need in living as mature men and women.

One of the difficulties we Unitarians face in discussing religion or in finding it for ourselves is that our culture, our religious institutions and our power figures in those institutions assert so pontifically that religion infallibly reveals ultimate meanings. What I think we must learn through the study of history is that not all religion has made such arrogant, man-proud assertions, and for this reason non-dogmatic religions have attained a value that the one-and-only religions really never attain, for all their aggressiveness. Let us note that finite and fallible man does not have to have an ultimate meaning, Reinhold Niebuhr and the Roman Popes of 1500 years notwithstanding. We Unitarians, and millions of other human beings in history, have quietly asserted as religious people that without cosmic, ultimate meanings man need not succumb to complacency or despair. Even when Dr. Samuel Johnson in 18th Century London said this in eloquent periods it did not make it true. This assertion that mankind meanings must have cosmic endorsement is simply a cultural habit inculcated by centuries of rabbis and ministers and priests at work. Other religious cultures, some older than either Israel or Christianity, deny it with equal authority of experience. It is the Christian culture, not all human history, that requires a guarantee of success in eternity for human nature and its values.

I agree with Herbert Muller and Julian Huxley that in the future all such supernaturalism may seem as archaic as animism does now, although animism was once believed quite universally, and considered natural. We with a modern religious outlook simply refuse to be dismissed from serious consideration by the Niebuhrs and Karl Barths who reject out of hand all honorable alternatives to their own views. They have every right to claim that they see appearances of cosmic order, suggestions of divine intelligence and a sidereal moral purpose at work. But men and women of equal religious



feeling have the right to report that they see no evidence of moral purpose in the ceaseless struggle for survival, even though they may see an evolution to ever newer and more cooperative forms of organization in nature. Those of us who do not see "a power not ourselves that makes for righteousness", in the universe are in a very long and honorable tradition of non-theistic religion with hundreds of millions of followers, Buddhist, Taoist, Confucianist, and other, a tradition that seems to us to hold a great deal of promise for the future in a day of science and new knowledges in many fields. Whole peoples, we should remember, Chinese, Roman, Greek, managed very well without expecting a God to consummate their history and validate their values eternally. The God-concept is historically not a common factor in religious cultures.

I am trying to avoid the solipsism of citing Unitarian sources for Unitarians, and thus talking just to ourselves. This is important because too many people think Unitarians are an eccentric off-beat sect who enjoy using the word "religion" for their private reflections, which the world passes by with a tolerant understanding that such aberrations are the price of avoiding further heresy hunts.

So I turn for a moment to William Ernest Hocking, a non-Unitarian, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Harvard, writing in a new book, *The Coming World Civilization*, which I strongly commend to you who wish to carry today's subject further. Dr. Hocking is a Christian believer in God. He has, however, none of the arbitrary arrogance of the TV ministers I castigated earlier, or of the archetype dogmatist, Reinhold Niebuhr, whom I have used as a symbol figure of Christian neo-orthodoxy this morning. I have every reason to suspect that Dr. Hocking would accept the definition of religion from Virgilius Ferm I used earlier. Dr. Hocking writes with penetrating insight about religion as the struggle of human souls carrying on the query-laden enterprise of living under existing conditions. He states, for example: "Religion without the organ of human thought is a blind survival. The day of private and local religions is over. Jealous gods and chosen people are no longer thinkable. We understand our ancestral reverences without accepting them."

He then continues in what to me is a richly religious temper by saying: "Religion involves a sense of process and direction, a realization of the forward-thrust of one's being. It is always autobiographical. It is marked by an element of immediacy. The integrating of human motives is the beginning of religion." Now this is what we at the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles are talking about and, I hope, doing, week after week, and year after year. It is religion in a deeply historical sense, and in a living universal sense. It is no peculiar aberration of your ministers or of the people who have come here for the past 82 years.

Permit me to quote William Ernest Hocking again, for this is an important voice for us to hear as we talk about religion. "The life



process of man," he says, "is end-seeking, involving an organism of causes. The end-seeking is a function of his interpretation of reality." Religion includes a reverence for men's many reverences, the ends they cherish, the values they hold needful for fulness of life. I speak of Dr. Hocking today because he is one of the truly honest figures in American religion in this century, as well as one of the most honored and respected.

Religion, in a day of dawning maturity and rationality, of insight into men's total personality needs, gives a roof over the head. It helps one build a dwelling for one's entire existence, not some fraction of it. If I did not believe that this was its function I would not be working here at this church year after year. Man cannot survive happily on fragments. Remember that earlier definition: "Religion involves an adjustment to that which is of ultimate concern." To find out what is of ultimate concern, and to make a personal, living adjustment to it, that is our task twenty-four hours a day. It must give you and me room for integrity, space for beauty, expansion of our spirits, freedom from any binding sectarian tradition that has hampered growth. It must help us satisfy our hunger for an inner peace that will never find full rest or equilibrium. It is an experience of dedication to the realities we find first-hand. It gives us a reverence for discovered truths, or approximations of truth, and a power to respect the reverences of others sincerely cherished. It helps us accept the human predicament of mortality, tragedy and frustration.

Religion helps us to discover that we live on an "island of light", to use Muller's lovely phrase. Life can be rich, though it have no certified meanings in eternity. Life is an end in itself. Such a statement is a basic religious belief. The sovereign values of love, of justice, of truth-seeking, whether they have cosmic grounding or not, are of immense importance. These experiences are indivisible, and cannot be taken from us when they have been experiences. Galileo in prison, Cranmer at the stake, Darwin assailed for decades as an infidel, all remind us of this truth.

I want to make it very clear that many men believe a new day is dawning for religion as defined today, in this age of expanding knowledge. Hocking, Huxley, Muller and many, many others write of it movingly. As Dr. Hocking put it so well, "The universal religions are already fused at the top." I know what he means. Julian Huxley, speaks for many, I believe, as he writes: "The new religion as an organ of destiny for better dealing with the orientation of the human species will at first be spread by a small minority, but it will in the course of time become universal . . . not in theory only but in practice. The properties of man's psychological nature make it inevitable. Man cannot avoid the process of convergence which makes for the integration of hostile human groups into a single world society and culture. It still remains for man to unify and universalize his religion."

As we close this thought together today, let me try to tie together what I have attempted to say. Religion is concerned with each man's personal adjustment to that which is most of concern to him in his universe. It is concerned, as we here so often say, with the conquest of all that shackles the human spirit. It is concerned with the conquest of disease, poverty, misery, ignorance, racialism, hatreds of self and of others; and it is concerned with these not for their own sake alone, but to release man everywhere, in all ages, and right now, to be himself at his best . . . man aware of himself, of his past, of his future. Religion becomes a rejection of all limited goals, all purely self-centered ends. Religion becomes the discipline of ourselves, whether in or out of an historic faith, with or without familiar mythology or a sanctioned poetry, to find the riches of a growing, expanding humanity, in a galactic system pushing back the mysteries that have enveloped man, to reveal new mysteries ever more amazing.

Such a religion, if we take it seriously, makes us labor in and out of season for bread and wine for every mouth alive, and for freedom of thought alight in every mind . . . in Johannesburg, in Peking, in Havana, in Los Angeles, and on the most distant planet, if life be there with which we can communicate.

Is this religion? Yes, historically, at many places and in many ages; a fact which dogmatists and fanatics have ignored and deliberately erased from many of the records of history, but nevertheless a fact we keep discovering to our vast delight. Such religion leaps barriers of nationality, of philosophies and metaphysics, of politics and economics, of arts and poetries. No other practice or discipline so universally and so completely performs this office as religion, for all its faults and treasons. In a day of freedom from the tyrannies of *élites* here and abroad, some rooted in centuries of evil, we can see the fruition of religion coming into its own. I hope we shall settle for nothing less . . . nor deny its opportunity through any failure of our own.

**Stephen H. Fritchman**, A.B. (Ohio), B.D. (Union), M.A. (New York Un.) was first settled at Bangor (1932-8), then became director of A.U.Y. (1938-47), then Editor of *The Christian Register* (1942-47). Since 1948 he has been Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles.

**David L. Watson** is a B.Sc. and Ph.D. of Edinburgh in physical chemistry and was also a Rockefeller Fellow at Columbia. He was in charge of the maintenance and repair of most of the Chemical industry in the U.S. during the war, as a member of the War Production Board. He has taught chemistry at New York University and physics at Antioch. He now lives on the West Coast of Scotland. He has written widely in scientific journals, has published *Scientists are Human* (Watts, London, 1938) and a critical appraisal of the social sciences: *The Study of Human Nature* (Antioch Press, 1954).



# The Will to Make-Believe

DAVID LINDSEY WATSON<sup>1</sup>

"But the world of fact, after all, is not good; and in submitting our judgement to it, there is an element of slavishness from which our thoughts must be purged."

BERTRAND RUSSELL

SO we are back where we started? So the ecstatic claims of religious faith, the austerity and devoutness and selfless heroism are all founded on a fiction, an appealing, useful fiction, but nevertheless a fiction?

We have made up our minds in advance of the facts, we are positively going to have a God who answers prayer? We are determined to stick to our make-believe?

You've said it. We are!

Back of all the corridors and the crannies of the great structures that are penetrated by the searchlights of science, there lies, and will always lie, the unknown and the unknowable. More than this: today we seem to 'know' so much, it is hard to realize that vast continents of the possible are utterly unknown to us. There will always be a white, unexplored area on the map of the cosmos. In this territory, the human spirit is free to make its own topography, to give "to airy nothing a local habitation and a name."<sup>2</sup>

Our experience has convinced us that man can not sustain his paradoxical role in the universe unless, in one way or another, it is responsive to *his* needs and *his* nature. We coolly, firmly, persistently, make the decision to project the highest attributes of our species into that no-man's-land, to continue the Great Pretense, to find in the unknowable, friendship, mercy and love.<sup>3</sup>

And we announce our intention without apology, secure in the knowledge that all the triumphs of the spirit of man have been won in just this way, that no man of science who knows his business can cast the first stone. For the conceptual constructions of science are projected into the Unknowable with the same arbitrariness. When probed to their roots—as has been done in the past few decades—the great theories of modern science are all found to be "open conspiracies."

<sup>1</sup> Personal note at foot of previous page.

<sup>2</sup> "And as imagination bodies forth  
The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen  
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing  
A local habitation and a name."

*Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act V, Scene 1

<sup>3</sup> *Psalm* 22, 3 recognizes this implicitly: "O Thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel."

It requires a special quality of humility—which most scientific men today lack—to sense the fact that this wilful decision to proceed with our task in the way which answers the needs of our minds is not confined to those climactic movements when Einstein, Planck or Heisenberg are pushing to the heart of the great problems of time, or energy, or radiation. The white area on the map of Being, on closer scrutiny, is found to send tendrils throughout all of the highly coloured areas.

If you are always preoccupied with the mountainous encyclopaedia of what is known, or what can be known better, you will lose the skill to discern what all poets know: that even the most clear-cut and unassailable of facts is imbedded in a context of mystery and wonder—a context which becomes evident whenever one of the master-builders of science turns his attention to it. The idea of substance, of matter, of mass, for instance, retains its quality of definiteness and finality only so long as we confine our attention to those aspects of its role that *are* known and understood. But all philosophical attempts to probe deeper, to exhibit once-for-all what actually we are doing when we operate in terms of the notion of substantiality—of material continuity—all end in the same question-mark, the essence of the thing slips through our fingers, and the deeper we probe, the clearer it becomes that we are grasping at shadows.

So long as the scientist confines himself to saying: “Well, here is an interesting habit of thought, a reassuring device of make-believe that originated deep in the mists of the past, and that, with suitable modifications to take into account our advancing insight, continues to serve us well . . . (in private, off the record, we must frankly admit we don’t really know what lies back of these uniformities)” . . . so long as he decides to travel by faith, and to fill the chasm of doubt with somewhat arbitrary but agreed rituals . . . to that extent he can go ahead and extend the area of the known.

And when he does so he is on much the same epistemological ground as the man who uses the idea of ‘God’ in the newer way we are urging: tentatively, empirically, poetically.

“Agreed,” replies the scientific sceptic. “The scientists of the nineteenth century witnessed (some of them with no little glee, we might add) the traditional props of revealed religion topple one after another. They did not foresee that we, their successors, would live to see substantially the same fate befall their absolute, objective, omnipotent science. Well, we have, I hope, learned our lesson. Human life and knowledge are impossible without the aid of abstractions. And every abstraction, even the most powerful and firmly based, has a way of getting out of hand—indeed of demonstrating substantially the same proclivity to undisciplined inebriation that, frankly, we find so objectionable in the idea of God. *The abstract conception is relevant only in that region of events and experiences which it helps to order.* It is always open to us (indeed we can’t avoid it) to extend it



beyond the sphere where it works. And thus we shall always have with us this shadowy region, that 'penumbra of uncertainty', where pseudo-problems and paradoxes flourish—this Unknowable area that so intrigues your over-ardent imagination. Yes it is there all right, this underworld of unjustifiable extrapolations."

"Now this greatly reconstructed 'God', that you claim to erect or even to find there," continues our sceptical rationalist, "is simply the extension or extrapolation of certain aspects of your human personality that you find to be helpful and worthy of cultivation. You *project* the notions of virtue and benevolence into the problematic area of the cosmos. And the cosmos later throws back to you an echo of your thoughts, just as it does, for a while, to our scientific enthusiasts of the ether, or of mass.

"So long as your pipe-dreams are kept out of the daylight of ascertainable facts, you can always achieve this self-hypnotic dissociation of your personality. But isn't the Thing out there, to which you pray, chum, just a reflection of your better self? And doesn't such a phantasm clearly fall short of the traditional idea of the creator of the ends of the earth, the Lord of Hosts, and the merciful Father?—And now I must be getting back to the lab."

Perhaps we'd better let him go back to *his* business—of projecting into the Unseen, the rational ingenuity which is the strong point of *his* personality.

Our scientist-critic has failed to note quite a number of things about the modern process of seeking God. Most of these, we shall explore elsewhere. Here let us merely note that there are others, many others, who are doing much the same thing as I—discovering that when the good and the true within them are attributed and subordinated to a (to begin with—hypothetical) Source beyond their personal consciousness, something momentous happens. They enter, as I do, a new region of experience, with its own laws and secrets, which, in the end, bites deeper and teaches more compellingly.

"*Clay is moulded into vessels, and because of the space where nothing exists, we are able to use them as vessels,*" said Lao Tse in the *Tao-Te-King* (Book XI).

In this unforgettable sortie we have a classical justification of an idea of God which, to start with, is frankly admitted to be an imaginative construction—to be the reflection of our needs.<sup>1</sup> Actually it is not true that inside the tea-cup, "nothing exists." For there is located what is more meaningful than the porcelain of the cup: the power to hold refreshment—the potentiality which is the reason for all vessels.

<sup>1</sup> This metaphor also points the way out of materialist metaphysics—where the reality of a form is assumed to reside chiefly at the loci of maximum potential gradient i.e. in atoms, sub-atomic particles, or in electromagnetic or gravitational fields of *force*: i.e. where the potentiality to *move* (other) matter is central.

An idealist metaphysics (like a valid relativism) will learn to fix attention also on the loci "where nothing exists."

This is the great Mystery. It is, if you want to put it that way, collective self-deception—the very thing that science, as most of us (wrongly) assume, has taught us to reject and supersede. It doesn't make sense, *but it works*. Indeed, that is to understate the case. It is the greatest idea in the world—"make-believe", though it seem to those who have never given it a try. The empirical fact, which science cannot deny, is that just when a man feels sure, secure, guided, protected, chided, yes, and loved, he becomes capable of his bravest and noblest. This is so obvious when he is still a child. It is no less true when he has become a man.

He just has to find in the nature of things, this benevolent response to his deepest need. And the wise man is he who will not let himself be distracted from the cultivation of those ideas, habits, traditions, hopes and institutions that strengthen the necessary illusion. You may stand aside from this hocus-pocus and give it what names you please: 'reactionary mysticism', 'cowardly superstition', 'befuddling self-hypnosis', 'fanaticism', 'infantilism', or the epithets of Nietzsche and Schopenhauer, *but in the end you will have missed the spiritual boat*. For try as you will, with your clearheaded rationalism, you will never achieve the sweet fruits of his act of Faith. For only in this way does a man become capable of living consistently for others, for the claims of the Race—with an unshakeable confidence that events will never betray him. He reproduces the mood of the well-loved child, and thus becomes capable of a selfless grandeur that will forever elude a wary mathematics of probabilities and causes.

. . . The relation of the wise mother to her child is regrettable and obscurantist: she wants the youngster to believe that this is a good and friendly world. So she brazenly protects him from a host of ugly realities, and her silly heart is warmed when she watches him happily preoccupied in the land of imagination. She has the quaint notion that the realities which well out from within the little bastard, are more real than those of the harsh, external imperatives she is postponing.

It is with this apparatus of delusion that the grown man has to make his basic adjustment to the frustrations and punishments of later life. You can't have it both ways, my rationalist friend! The unloved child grows up to become the self-centered 'problem-case', incapable of loving others. A mode of rearing the young that would eliminate the proclivity to mystical aspiration must also inevitably produce antisocial monsters.

So, after all, God is our creation? How then can we pray to Him in our need, worship Him, obey Him? Are we to worship the work of our own minds?

My friend, you have no difficulty in loving, praising and even obeying other less elevated human creations. When you lovingly wash the car of a Saturday afternoon, when you thrill with noble thoughts at the sight of the Stars and Stripes or the Union Jack, when you fatuously attribute to your lady-love all sorts of virtues



she does not have, what are you doing but worshipping an automobile, a nation or a sweetheart? This is no figurative exaggeration. The craving of the human heart for reverence and submission will not be gainsaid. Man is incurably the god-maker.

Why then should he not seek the best and greatest Focus for his reverences of which he is capable—fashioned of all his purest, noblest, bravest, most reliable yearnings? Whenever he has done so—and every generation has—he has invariably found that his invention has quickly acquired an independent, objective reality—in countless secret thoughts, in customs of benevolence and foresight, and writ large in the style of his institutions and in the movements of his history. The straw-God breathes and moves in the realm of the spirit, and—strange interlude!—overpowers and overawes his progenitor—to the extent that He *is* a God of goodness and of light.

And this would not be possible unless the pitiful devices of the artisan—the words, the rituals, the prayers, the beliefs, and the progressive guidance of life by these—unless the arbitrary piecemeal foundations of the myth have found in the nature of things some Tendency, some Force, some Principle that responds to them, unites with them, and, in the end, gives them vitality and glory.

So the successful God-maker will always end, like Moses, by recognizing that his function has been that of the symbolizer, the interpreter, the intermediary, the discoverer. His aphorisms, tabus, ecstasies, creeds and temples are the means by which the Unseen reality is evoked and given objective intercourse with the hungry, earthbound souls of men. The essence of the matter turns out to be not these ever-arbitrary devices, but the Unseen Presence and Influence to which they give access.

These pages may sound all right to the unchurched who feel the need of religion. The devout will be shocked or offended, without perhaps being able to say why. And they are right.

This is a freshman's route to God. It accepts the limitations of his or her religious experience and insight and goes on from there. What the argument amounts to is that if he relaxes his intellectual doubts, an astounding change may happen to his cosmic feeling. But none of the elements and energies which coalesce in this development are his or mine. The scriptures, the worship, the habits of forbearance and charity that gently win me, grew step by step over immense stretches of history. In this growth, I had no part, nor do I now understand more than mere fragments of these tendencies and traditions. What I supply is merely a willingness to give them a chance, to let them work on me. And even that, in the last analysis, comes from without.

If, in so doing, I assume that "God" is, in a measure, my creation, I am like "the dog that barked the sun up." Getting out and around a couple of mornings before dawn, Fido noted that while he was barking, the sun rose. Bursting with pride, he inferred that he was gifted with a magical power. He made some further controlled

experiments, and established the law that the more he barked, the higher the sun rose. And this was O.K., until one morning it rained; and the next he overslept . . .

When the experience of God begins to take hold of a man, the deep need, the helpful tradition, the vigorous, outgoing church, the texture of kindly potentiality empower him to grow in this direction. Yet all these miracles of biological and cultural evolution have arisen with but the most feeble conscious aid of any man. Regard them as unrelated if you will. But they emerged out of the womb of the possible, for the most part, without our knowing how, or without more than a peripheral control. The thought that all that permits us to worship and have faith is shaped by a single Ordering Power, may seem arbitrary to start with. But once it has taken hold of us, it is purely blind vanity to regard it as something *we* have chosen. *It has chosen us.* The tradition is far nearer the truth when it says: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." (*John* 15, 16).

## *Universalism in English Liturgiology*

ALEC ELLIOTT PEASTON

ONE of the cataclysmic happenings of the twentieth century has been the coming together of East and West. At the beginning of the century the great imperialist, Rudyard Kipling, could prophesy that "Never the twain should meet." By the middle of the century a candidate for the American presidency was to arouse the electorate with speeches on "One World." The Western christian may be certain of the unique character of his religion. But he can no longer ignore the religions of the East. Nor, be it admitted, does he seek to do so.

The cultivated Christian of the modern age is less ready than was his father to dismiss 'the heathen Chinees' as peculiar. His attitude is thus far different from that of the mediaeval Christian who held the vast non-Christian world to be beyond the pale. But even the mediaeval Christian was not permitted to remain too complacently exclusive. Crusaders who journeyed to far distant Asia to save the Holy Sepulchre discovered to their astonishment that even the sons of 'the false Mahound' could have their virtues. The knightly character of Saladin was renowned throughout Christendom. In the thirteenth century the Venetian, Marco Polo, made his amazing journey to the court of Kublai Khan. A friendly Pope, Gregory X, gave him encouragement. The traveller, though a good Catholic, perceived the virtues of Buddhism. "Had Buddha been a Christian," he wrote, "he would have been a great saint of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is of real significance that John Wesley should have declared that he could not agree that all those who had never heard



of the historical Christ were lost for ever. Increasingly, the idea of the unity of mankind has taken possession of the human mind. And thoughtful men have come to see in all religions a common human striving after God. Thus it was the well known Presbyterian divine George Matheson, who wrote a hymn included in the Anglican, *Songs of Praise*; (*Hymns of Worship* 267: *Hymns of the Spirit* 418).

Gather us in, thou love that fillest all;  
Gather our rival faiths within thy fold.  
Rend each man's temple-veil and bid it fall,  
That we may know that thou hast been of old.

Thine is the mystic life great India craves,  
Thine is the Parsee's sin-destroying beam,  
Thine is the Buddhist's rest from tossing waves,  
Thine is the Empire of vast China's dream.

A study of comparative religion has not only made the Christian more tolerant and understanding of other world Faiths. It has enabled him to appreciate with a truer insight the development and nature of his own. Nor is the loyalty of the Christian to Christ in any way lessened by his awareness of the excellencies inherent in other religions. Jesus Christ remains for him the unique revelation of God. As Professor Edmund Soper says in an article on "Comparative Religion," "There is a certain inevitability about Him which makes Him in a very real sense the centre of the world's religious life. As He is unique, so is Christianity unique. The growing tendency of the comparative study of religions is to emphasise this uniqueness and raise Him to ever higher summits in the estimation of candid men both within and without the bounds of Christianity." This statement represents the general concensus of Christian opinion. It is not, however, shared by everyone. Of late years certain groups have appeared which refuse to see in Christianity an unique revelation. Such groups are not numerically significant, though they are not without interest or importance. They are part of twentieth century religious life, and very strangely, they have a bearing on liturgiology.

One of the pioneers of Universalism was Dr. Walter Walsh.

Brought up in a strict Protestant sect in Scotland, he reacted against the severe Calvinism of his youth. A graduate of Glasgow University, Walsh developed remarkable powers as a controversialist, and attracted great crowds both in Scotland and the North of England. He relates in his book, *My Spiritual Pilgrimage*, how he came to feel "that even the most advanced Christianity could not satisfy the full needs of the modern man". It was in Dundee that he founded "The Free Religious Movement" to promote world religion and world brotherhood. Later he succeeded Charles Voysey as minister of the Theistic Church in London, but resigned in 1916 owing to his pacifist views. That year he inaugurated the Free Religious Movement in London. In 1931 Dr. Walsh was

succeeded in the leadership of the movement by the Rev. Will Hayes.

Hayes was already editor of *Calamus*, a quarterly journal devoted to the study of comparative religion. Since 1921 he had been minister of the Chatham Unitarian Church, and as "Brother John" was to contribute many articles to *The Inquirer*. He is regarded with affection in Unitarian circles, but his influence has not been very great. As he himself confesses in his book *Unitarians of the United World* the Unitarian General Assembly has given little attention to his wider view, nor has it been forthcoming in publishing Universalist books. Unitarians may sing with gusto Samuel Longfellow's hymn:

"One holy Church of God appears  
Through every age and race."

but they are, in practice, deeply devoted to the Christian tradition. Hayes, therefore, instituted his "Order of the Great Companions"\*

There has always been a Universalist strain in Unitarianism, and one of the most distinguished of the recent principals of Manchester College, Oxford, Dr Estlin Carpenter, was an authority on Buddhism, and Wilde Lecturer in comparative religion at Oxford University. The General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches publicly salutes "The faithful of all the great religions of the world because we believe that the love of God embraces all men and that all members of the human family are equal under heaven". In actual fact, however, almost all English Unitarian Congregations remain within the Christian tradition. Occasionally the Universalist note is sounded in Unitarian liturgiology, but it is never prominent. In 1878, however, a liturgy was published by Peter Dean at Walsall entitled, *Prayers and Ministries for Public Worship in Six Services*. This would appear to be an original composition, theistic but scarcely Christian, though the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes are included. Each service has its own theme, adoration, aspiration, thanksgiving, duty, and contrition. In the Addendum are "Short Ministries" designed for use before the prayer in an ordinary "Free Service". These include sayings from the Buddhist Scriptures in the form of responses by Minister and people. Thus the Minister recites: "Buddha said: 'self-restraint and chastity, the knowledge of the great principles, a mind secure and tranquil, and the hope of the eternal condition; these are excellences.'" The people respond "This is the doctrine of the enlightened". Similar quotations are recited from the Koran. "Mahommed taught his followers, saying, "Your true wealth is the good you do in this world." And again, "Zoroaster and his disciples have taught, saying, "In virtuous thoughts, words, deeds, God is manifested. Your saviour is your deeds and God himself." Finally, there are Platonisms. "Plato taught in ancient

\* The recent death of Will Hayes, May 17th, 1959, makes the publication of this article now especially appropriate as an all too meagre tribute to a gifted and lovable man.—Ed.

Greece, saying, "there is but one God, and we ought to love and serve Him".

The Order of The Great Companions was founded in Dublin by Will Hayes in 1929 "to further the study of Comparative Religion and all that makes for the realisation of the Unity of All Life". The title is derived from Walt Whitman's line, "Allons after the Great Companions, and to belong to them!" This order, composed of many people in different parts of the world, honours the masters of all Religions, and finds inspiration in the scriptures of all Faiths. Its aim is to prepare the way for a world Religion. It holds, with Whitman, that there are "Saviours countless, and Bibles incessant".

The Order of The Great Companions was united with the Free Religious Movement in 1938. In that year the order equipped a spacious hall in Montague Street, London, next to the British Museum. The new Headquarters was officially opened on March 22nd, 1939. The premises included a fine library which was open daily for students of comparative religion. Among those who took part in the opening service was the Iman of Woking Mosque. This venture of the Order, so promisingly begun, was wrecked in the Second World War.

But Hayes was not discouraged. Making his headquarters at Hertha's Chapel, Meopham Green, Kent, and remaining minister of Chatham Unitarian Church, he has built up a membership of his order which includes Hindus, Buddhists, Moslems, and Humanists. The order has had the blessing of both Rabindranath Tagore and Mahatma Gandhi.

Among the ten books taken by Gandhi to prison was Hayes' *Book of the Cow*.

It was in 1924 that Hayes published *A Book of Twelve Services*. For some time he had felt the need of a new liturgy that would be universalist in outlook. In his preface he wrote, "A Prophetic passage from one of Whitman's private notebooks sums up the idea behind the services".

"There are that specialize a book, or some one divine life, as the only revelation. I, too, doubtless own it, whatever it is, to be a revelation, apart, but I see all else, all nature, and each and all that to it apertains, the processes of time, all men, the universes, all likes and dislikes and developments—a hundred, a thousand other Saviours and Mediators and Bibles—they too just as much revelations as any. The grand and vital theory of religion . . . must admit all, and not a part merely".

In 1936 Hayes produced an additional service called "The Lord of Life". In 1954 he published *Every Nation Kneeling*.\* This includes the original twelve services, "The Lord of Life", and a fourteenth service entitled "Every Nation Kneeling", first published separately in 1937 and now giving its title to the larger volume. The

\* Obtainable from Inge Hyde, (Secretary, Church of the Great Companions) 28, Horsted Way, Rochester, Kent, England. 10/6 or \$2.00, postage included. Also Memorial Cards of Will Hayes, *gratis*.



services are for use in the Church of the Great Companions, as the Chatham Unitarian Church is now called.

The prayer book, *Every Nation Kneeling*, has aroused considerable interest in different communities. It was given an appreciative review by Mr. Christmas Humphreys, Leader of the English Buddhists, in *The Middle Way*. The World Congress of Faiths, which was founded by Sir Francis Younghusband, acknowledges its debt to the book in the December, 1954, number of *Forum*. The fourteenth service in the prayer book has been used many times by the World Congress of Faiths. In Australia, some of the services from this liturgy have been broadcast.

These fourteen services are grouped round different themes. Such themes are "The Vision", "The Wider View", "The World is One", "Catholicity", "The Unity of Things", "God is Goodness", "The Lord of Life" and "Every Nation Kneeling". The services conform, with only slight variation to a simple pattern. This consists of Opening Sentences, Hymn, Exhortation, Prayers 'Our Father', Canticle, Reading, Canticle, Reading, Canticle, Solo or Voluntary, Prayers, Announcements, Offertory, Hymn, Sermon, Hymn, and Benediction. Prayer and Canticles are derived from many sources, and in themselves make an excellent anthology of devotional passages. The influence of the New England writers is marked. Extracts are taken from the works of Thoreau, Whitman, Whittier, Samuel Longfellow, Emerson, Lowell, Holmes, W. C. Gannett and Minot J. Savage. The conception of these services can be appreciated by an examination of the well-known Fourteenth. The Opening sentences are derived from the Koran, the Atharva Veda, the Metta Sutta, Confucius, Isaiah, and the New Testament. A hymn of Samuel Longfellow follows. Then comes an exhortation from the Rock Edict XIII of Asoka, a prayer, and a canticle from Isaiah, a reading, and a canticle from the Bhagavad Gita. These are succeeded by a reading, and a canticle consisting of the Buddhist Beatitudes. Prayers follow from the words of Muhammad, Whittier, the Zend Avesta, a Vedic hymn, and an extract from the Prayer Book prayer for all conditions of men. A hymn entitled Akbar's Dream (derived from Tennyson), and George Matheson's hymn "Gather us in", with a closing prayer, completes the service.

The other services in this prayer book are of a similar character. It is difficult to apply the ordinary canons of criticism to a liturgy of so original a character. Its appeal will depend very much on the individual predilections of the reader or worshipper. Its importance lies in the link it provides between an ever narrowing East and West.

**Alec Elliott Peaston** was an Exhibitioner at Jesus College, Oxford, 1930-3, M.A. and B.Litt. He prepared for the University at Manchester College, was at Harvard as Hibbert Scholar 1936-37 and held Ministries at Padiham and Halifax before moving to Dromore, Northern Ireland, where he has been since 1949.

# *A Doctrine of the Holy Spirit for the Modern World*

F. J. HAMBLIN

THE task that I have set myself is not to lay before you a finished doctrine and then expound its meaning, but rather to suggest certain conditions that a Doctrine of the Spirit must satisfy and certain characteristics that it must possess if it is to have meaning for the modern world. It seems probable that, by considering such basic requirements, we may find that differing individual beliefs concerning the Holy Spirit share a common character and are interpretations of a common experience. We are much more likely to agree upon the conditions which our beliefs should satisfy, and thus, be able to indicate the common ground from which our diversities proceed, than to formulate an agreed doctrine in set terms. If I indicate, as I must, certain points of personal belief, it is for the purpose of considering how *a* doctrine, namely my own, answers to the tests I propose.

The eight characteristics which I have chosen to discuss fall into four pairs, and I shall begin with a rapid review of them. A doctrine must be both *tenable* and *communicable*. An individual must be able to accept it as personal belief, with his whole mind, in the light of all his knowledge and experience. Yet a private belief, however true, that cannot be imparted to others is *not* a doctrine; before we can speak of a doctrine we must have a teaching which can be grasped by people living in our world.

The doctrine must be both *intimate* and *universal*. It is an interpretation of the inward experience of a great variety of men and women. Not infrequently we experience a Something Within responding to, and even identical with, Something Beyond. However this may be interpreted, there is a feeling of direct communion and unity with a Universal Spirit.

The next two characteristics, I call, with some reservation, *mystery* and *certainly*. We cannot reduce spiritual experience to precise definition nor explain it in the language of the physical world, and to rob it of such accompaniments as wonder, reverence, joy and exaltation, awe and humiliation, would be to destroy it. Yet the assurance remains that there is some vision or apprehension of truth which is valid, however difficult it may be to interpret or even identify what has been communicated.

Finally, the doctrine must be both *inspiring* and *realistic*. Intimate communion with the Source of all Goodness, Truth and Beauty must have power to direct and invigorate the life and must evoke a faith that this Goodness is the Supreme and Abiding Reality.

We must in our doctrine present the Spirit as a source both of striving and serenity. Yet the world, as it is, and we, as we are, contain much that is foreign to the Holy Spirit of God. Ours cannot, therefore, be a doctrine that ensures comfort by turning our backs on life. However false we regard the dualism of God and Devil, or flesh and spirit, however firm our faith in the Purpose of an altogether good God, our doctrine must admit the present existence of what is not God.

With the best intention of discussing these features of a doctrine—its tenability, communicability, intimacy, universality, mystery, certainty, inspiration and reality, with some system, I find a certain difficulty arising from the very subject of the doctrine. "The wind (or spirit) bloweth (or breatheth) where it listeth"—which is not only a reminder that spiritual experience is hard to dissect and label, but also that the Johannine doctrine incorporated a view of the natural world very different from our own. We shall return to this point later. Meanwhile, let us begin our more systematic treatment by quoting from certain modern writers.

In his *Ideas and Opinions* Albert Einstein says that "the religion of fear and moral religion, in varying proportions, are common to all religious systems . . . But there is a third stage of religious experience which belongs to all of them, even though it is rarely found in a pure form. I shall call it cosmic religious feeling. It is very difficult to elucidate this feeling to anyone who is entirely without it, especially as there is no anthropomorphic conception of God corresponding to it . . . The individual feels the futility of human desires and aims, and the sublimity and marvellous order which reveal themselves both in nature and the world of thought. Individual existence impresses him as a sort of prison and he wants to experience the universe as a single significant whole."

Later, Einstein exclaims "What a deep conviction of the rationality of the universe and what a yearning to understand. . . . Kepler and Newton must have had to enable them to spend years of solitary labour in disentangling the principles of celestial mechanics!" He then comments: "You will hardly find one of the profoundest sort of scientific minds without a religious feeling of his own . . . His religious feeling takes the form of a rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection."

Einstein regards this feeling which, to the scientist, is the guiding principle of his life and work as "closely akin to that which has possessed the religious geniuses of all ages."

Einstein rejects belief in a personal God and in prayer—because to him "personal" means only anthropomorphic, and prayer is simply asking for interference with the natural order. What he means by "moral religion" is not ethical monotheism, as we understand it, but a system of rewards and punishments.



He "is moved by profound reverence for the rationality made manifest in existence." He attains "a humble attitude of mind toward the grandeur of reason incarnate in existence." Yet this mind or intelligence which is revealed, this rationality which is to be revered, this grandeur of reason incarnate, must not be described as personal. "How," asks Einstein, "can cosmic religious feeling be communicated from one person to another, if it can give rise to no definite notion of a God and no theology? In my view, it is the most important function of art and science to awaken this feeling and keep it alive in those who are receptive to it."

Most of us, I presume, would agree with Einstein to the extent that we reject, in the main, the *things* that he rejects, while retaining *words* that he discards. We are faced, in short, with a difference in vocabulary—in the meanings attached to particular words; and this is a fact of great importance to our present purpose. Einstein was describing and interpreting a personal experience which he also ascribed to scientific minds in general and to Kepler and Newton in particular. It is significant that he regarded this feeling as "closely akin to that which has possessed the religious geniuses of all ages," for assuredly those religious geniuses described their experience in terms, many of which Einstein would have rejected. Yet there was in them an awareness that he recognised as essentially the same as his own. Whether it be an Isaiah calling, "Woe is me . . . for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts," or an Einstein filled with rapturous amazement and a sense of futility, there are factors in the experience that are beyond the power of words to communicate. "The spirit itself pleads for us with longings that cannot be uttered." In our own limited sphere, when we are exalted by some vision of beauty, enthralled by some perception of truth, illumined by some glimpse of holiness, the sensation is literally unutterable. None of the words of common speech, nor of any specialised vocabulary, altogether fit the experience. To describe it, to reason about it, we must choose the words that seem to come nearest; and one man's choice of words can be quite different from another's.

What we are engaged upon is an attempt to interpret the experience, and if we are to do it fruitfully we must be tolerant of diverse vocabularies. Our aim should not be verbal uniformity but mutual recognition. The experience or feeling may be evoked in different ways and be associated with different objects, even in the same person at various times, and still more variously among different people, and it is capable of a very wide range of intensity. You either know it and can recognise it, or you do not know it and it cannot be described to you. It may involve a sense of communion with a Being, as in worshipful or mystical experience; or a feeling of contact with a Mind revealing itself, as in intellectual discovery.

If we are to have a doctrine of the Holy Spirit or of the Indwelling God it must proceed from the acceptance of the experience as valid; and that the feeling *can* be and, in fact, sometimes is, an

actual intimate communion with Another—an immediate contact with a Mind. We must indeed postulate that we have something to interpret—an experience that goes beyond our daily dealings with things, an experience that is beyond any interpretation. Yet we must needs interpret, if only to assure the questioning mind that the experience is true and the gifts of the spirit valuable.

For, unless the experience can be accepted by the mind, it will be dismissed as an illusion; and if it has not been accepted by the whole mind it will either be reduced to unimportance or degraded, in interpretation, into an item of dogma. This degrading process is mentioned by Pringle-Pattison when he speaks of “the materialism which has succeeded in transforming the profound doctrine of the Spirit, as the ultimate expression of the unity and communion of God and man, into the notion of another distinct Being, a third centre of consciousness mysteriously united with the other two.”

Is there not a close connection between this thought of the unity and communion of God and man with the expression already quoted from Einstein, concerning the desire “to experience the Universe as a single significant whole”? A satisfying doctrine of the Spirit must be an interpretation of a relationship that is felt as both communion with God and experience of a significant universe. Julian Huxley once defined religion “as the reaction of the personality as a whole to its experience of the Universe as a whole” but came to consider this definition “incomplete and also too vague and general.” He writes, “A chance reference in an article by that fine character and teacher, Estlin Carpenter, put me on the track; I had been too general, too much preoccupied with theology and reason, and had neglected the specific psychological basis of religion. *That* is to be found in the sense of holiness or sacredness. From this starting point all religion takes its flight, and only gradually (though inevitably) do the moral and intellectual become attached to it and fight their battle for completeness and unity.”

This “battle for completeness and unity”, which I regard as the attempt to interpret, necessarily involves both mind and conscience. The mind, trying to relate its sense of communion to its experience of the Universe, inevitably incorporates in its reasoning a great deal of acquired opinion and other learning. In particular the interpretation will involve a view of the physical world. I can only explain my relations with the Universal Spirit in terms of the Universe I think I know.

This is where older interpretations of the doctrine have broken down. It is no longer possible to hold them with the whole mind. As soon as my doctrine of the Spirit assumes a physical world other than that which my mind accepts, I am faced with a mental dichotomy. It is only when I can express my beliefs in words that I myself can unreservedly accept, that I can appreciate the truth enshrined in other formulations of the doctrine.

There is a close resemblance, even in terminology, between Einstein's "rationality incarnate" and "the Logos become flesh" which points to a recognisable similarity of experience. Yet the argument with Nicodemus only becomes intelligible when the meanings of wind and spirit are seen as virtually interchangeable. So long as it was possible to regard the wind as, literally, the breath or Spirit of God, and our own breath as the human spirit, and just so long as each of these meanings could be expressed by the same word, was there no difficulty in relating spiritual intimations to physical experience. One could say with Job, "The spirit of God is in my nostrils." This clear identification of the breath within with the surrounding atmosphere, gave easy and natural acceptance to the doctrine of a spirit both within and beyond.

That acceptance became unnatural and forced as soon as scientific investigation made headway. We cannot think of our local atmosphere as an omnipresent Spirit; nor can we regard the Indwelling God as a mixture of gases. We could still speak symbolically of a spiritual atmosphere but the literal acceptance is lost beyond recovery; and until recently there has been nothing to take its place, nothing that could be advanced as both scientifically true and truly representing our spiritual status. In consequence there has been a separation, amounting at times, to downright opposition, between religion and science. It is with the separation, rather than the supposed conflict, that I am concerned; for it has led many religious people into another wordly fiction and many others to concentrate exclusively on practical applications (often of a partisan nature), with little attention given to fundamental doctrines. This, in my opinion, is disastrous. If our foundation is indeed faulty, let us seek a better; but for goodness sake let us not try to build the Heavenly City on no foundation at all.

I tried to show, in a previous article (Vol. 11, Pt. 1) that modern science has provided us with a concept that is serviceable in an attempt to re-interpret spiritual experience. I wrote that paper in ignorance that Sir Francis Younghusband had developed a similar idea. So, to save the invidious practice of citing myself, I will quote from him:—

"At any rate for me personally the most reasonable view is to regard the universe as one vast being, out of which I was born, in which I always remain, and of which I am an active constituent part. The universe, in fact, bears to me, and I bear to the universe, the same relationship that I bear to each cell of my body and that each cell bears to me. We know from science that each of us is composed of millions of millions of cells—microscopic organisms of great complexity in spite of their diminutive size. Each of these cells is a living organism capable of assimilation, growth and decay. Each has rudimentary indications of mind, in that it can select what is in accord with its requirements and reject what is harmful . . . Each man has helped to form those cells of which he is composed.



On the other hand, they are constituent parts of him and have gone to form him. Similarly, the universe has formed me, but I remain a constituent part of it and, as such, go to form the universe. As one of the tiny cells of which I am made might struggle to know what I in my fulness was like, so am I now striving to know what the "I" of the Universe is like."

Modern science has given us a conception of "lives within a Life" from which there is no escaping unless we deny the biological doctrine that each cell is an individual living entity, or reject our immediate experience of an organism as an individual living entity. We must therefore accept this most mysterious inter-relationship of lives within the living organism, of smaller lives within a larger life to which they contribute, and of the larger life entering into the smaller lives, which it shapes and supports.

This is profoundly mysterious. I cannot give or try to give any reasoned explanation of it; and therein lies its supreme importance for the modern world.

For the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is also one of "lives within a Life" and of that Life entering into the Lives. This conception can no longer be dismissed by a scientific materialist as merely metaphysical, mystical or any other term he uses to mean moonshine. It is grounded in the materialist's own science and reduces his favourite mechanistic arguments to pulp. A dogmatic materialist trying to present a reasoned case has become a most pitiable sight, for his only hope of success lies in arguing himself out of existence.

If then, and this is important, I endeavour to interpret my spiritual experience as, in one aspect, an awareness of a Universal Spirit, and in another aspect, as an influence, an entering in, of that Spirit into mine, I do not have to divide my mind nor entertain ideas that conflict with my notions of physical reality. I have a doctrine of the Spirit that is tenable by my whole mind; one in which my apprehensions of spiritual truth and physical truth are but different aspects of one Whole Truth.

Until now we have been examining the tenability of the doctrine with reference to modern knowledge. We must remember, however, that it must also stand as an interpretation of ordinary experience. A philosopher may, *as a philosopher*, define a person as a causally connected chain of events in space-time and yet, *as a husband*, think quite differently of his wife when the breakfast bacon is burnt. We must not fall into that kind of mental division. If our doctrine requires a view of the nature of man, it must be one that applies to every person in all circumstances. That is to say, the doctrine must be an interpretation, not only of deep spiritual experience but also of the common facts of life, covering even the mutual recriminations of a philosopher and his wife over the breakfast table. Or, to put it in another way, it must, without radical alteration, be satisfying both to the informed and thoughtful person and to one whose main interests are of the kind called practical.

In attempting to describe spiritual experience, a difficulty arises from its very intimacy. There is a sense of being in direct contact with a Supreme Reality, of receiving a communication from without and yet of *belonging*, of being *at one with*, of actually *being part of* this Reality, which nevertheless is unutterably beyond. From this experience, as it has impressed itself upon the great religious geniuses, springs religious teaching. But unless their experience was understandable, unless the ordinary man or woman had some experience of their own, however vague and transitory, that answered to the deep and exalted experience, there could be no response, no perpetuation of a religious movement as a living religion. The Holy Spirit in Jesus must speak to a spirit in me or I cannot hear him at all. The intimate experience of the mystic or the prophet would, to others, be meaningless and of no value unless it held *something* that the ordinary prosaic person could recognise. Professor C. C. J. Webb says, "there is a serious danger of overlooking the existence of a genuine religious experience, which although taking forms less strange and striking, is not therefore less real and significant, in a vast number of persons who, though innocent of mystical raptures or crises of conversion, yet pass their lives against the background of a constant consciousness of being in the presence of a Power behind appearances, a Disposer of events, a Judge of conduct to whom or to which they are responsible and owe reverence, and more or less regularly discharge their debt in ways dictated by the traditions and habits of the social group to which they belong."

Regarding this experience which ranges from the rapture of a mystic to the worshipful feeling of a commonplace person, as a true one, and in which there is actual communion and communication, then truth is communicated however the experience be interpreted. The question "What does the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God," remains valid, however my conception of God may differ from the prophet's Yahweh. Firmly as I maintain that my doctrine must be tenable in the light of my own knowledge, the Spirit itself, and the word it whispers in the heart, do not depend on my, or any other interpretation. As I have already suggested we must look beyond specific doctrines or interpretations to their cognisable features of common experience. One of these, I suggest, is what Einstein called "cosmic religious feeling." With him it took the form of "rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection." Compare with this "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and stars that thou hast ordained; what is man that thou art mindful of him?" However different their thoughts, the feelings of Einstein and the Psalmist are recognisably alike. Einstein moreover, speaks of wanting "to experience the universe as a single significant whole." In the citations from Einstein we find

indications of a whole range of states—rapture, amazement, harmony, revelation, intelligence, superiority, insignificance, significance, wholeness, with a longing for something more, which is recognisably akin to the awe, joy, reverence, exaltation, humility, and the yearning for the fulness of a communion that has been only partly experienced, that is found in the specifically theistic interpretation of the Psalmist.

We may find it significant that one who is so strongly resistant to the idea of God should nevertheless relate his experience to a mind or intelligence beyond himself. He spoke with assurance of that mind as unquestionably real. He felt that he had apprehended some small part of its working which assured him of the vast incomprehensibility of the mind itself. The feeling aroused by Einstein's limited apprehension became "the guiding principle of his life and work."

Our doctrine of the Spirit must accordingly express an organic and enduring relationship between our own spirit and the Universal Spirit. But if the "I of the universe" or "God immanent in the physical universe" is taken to be the whole of God, if deity is solely expressed in the space-time of the universe, then surely the corresponding limitation applies also to me. The "I, here and now" the "Self immanent in my body" must be the whole of me, and I assuredly perish with my body, and there can be no question of immortality. But if, on the other hand, I find evidence that I, in some way, transcend the physical organism, I must necessarily ascribe no less a transcendence to God.

I pause here for a moment to remind you that I do not base my religious belief on these considerations. The ground of belief is the immediacy of religious experience itself. What we are now considering is our *reasons* for accepting this experience as a true one and its intimations as trustworthy. We are not making the foundations of faith, only testing them. And in that testing I shall now take up the tool of parapsychology. For my own part, I take the results obtained over a period of years at Duke University to be conclusive in themselves, apart from the less elaborate investigations elsewhere. We are justified in speaking of the facts of Extra Sensory Perception, such as clairvoyance, telepathy and precognition. Amongst those who have read no reports of the experiments, nor pondered the statistics, there is a widespread but reluctant tendency to admit that there may be *something* in telepathy and to ascribe it to some undiscovered physical radiation—assuming that our bodies contain undiscovered but highly selective transmitters and receivers. Great pains and ingenuity have been devoted to this very point. In the words of J. B. Rhine, "It is not necessary to say more at this point concerning the significance of parapsychology for religion than to point to its experimental refutation of a physical theory of man."

Another of his conclusions is that "it is probable that everyone has *psi* capacity but that there are individual and even group differences in the way in which the capacity is regarded and, to some extent, the readiness with which it may be allowed to function." Also,



discussing the considerations that prompted the starting of his own experiments, he says "the apparent contact of mind with mind across the reach of space seemed to suggest a transcendence of the material order by the human mind." Transcendence of time as well as space has been strongly confirmed by his own work.

We find accordingly that investigation by modern scientific methods has established, in specific instances, two principles of profound religious significance. In the separately living cells of a living organism, there are lives within a life; in the mind of the living being, there is a capacity to communicate and receive communications, which is independent of all sensory perception, independent also of time as well as space. A living being is not fully describable as a physical organism.

Both of these things are profoundly mysterious. I do not profess to explain them, but I have to accept them as *fact*. And, with Bertrand Russell, "I mean by a fact something which is there whether anybody thinks so or not." When I speak of a fact as mysterious, I think of mystery as it is described by H. G. Wood. "A mystery is a fact of experience which you cannot hope to fathom or understand and by which you have to live,"

Mystery thus attaches itself to established fact; where there is no fact there is not mystery but only fancy. The facts we have to interpret are those of spiritual experience. The problem concerns the essential nature of that experience: Is it unity and communion with *God*? And if we answer 'Yes', affirming this as fact, we have given a rational answer which is not vitiated by its mystery, so long as the same mystery attaches, in the same way, to any acknowledged fact. I speak of an element of our personality that transcends the physical organism; and if a scientific materialist denies the existence of such an element, I can join issue with him on the matter of fact. If an atheistic biologist scornfully asks how my life can be within a larger Life, I can say "In just the same way as a cell in your toe contrives to live within you."

Further, I believe that I am living in a Universe, both physical and spiritual, that can be "experienced as a significant whole." In my present state of being, my experience is infinitesimal and fragmentary, and because of this I must differentiate and make distinctions—if only for the sake of being intelligible to those whose experience is equally fragmentary—between physical and spiritual, mental and material. Yet I have a profound conviction that one Mind and Spirit operates through and expresses Himself in all. The more truly I interpret my experience, including these various kinds, the more coherence shall I find among them all. This, to me, is the true meaning of living in a Universe; and although I have to speak of God as expressing Himself as revealed in the Universe, yet ultimately I regard it more true to speak of the Universe being in God, than of God being in the Universe.

I have grounds (satisfying to myself if to nobody else) for believing that we live within, and ourselves participate in, a single continuous creative process—of which the tiny process of organising the cells into a body is an actual part—that the whole process ranging from God to the electron is coherent, and its significance can be partly appreciated by a true appreciation of our own limited experience. Now taking it as a fact that my body cells have lives independent of mine, and as another fact that they are so much a part of me that a materialist can say that they *are* me, I can only account for this mysterious inter-relationship by what I have called “mutual awareness”, an awareness that functions apart from consciousness and without sensory perception, just as in the *psi* phenomena. For myself, I find the thought of this constant, unconscious mutual awareness between my cells and myself of great help in thinking of an act of worship as a mutual process between God and man; for as I certainly do not have to switch my attention from one cell to another, even so I have no need to imagine God turning his mind from one worshipper to another.

“Mutual awareness” is precisely the state, as it seems to me, that is brought to the foreground in prophetic inspiration. “And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my word into thy mouth” indicates Jeremiah’s sense that the Lord was aware of him, as well as he of the Lord. It is the state also implied in the language of worship. By virtue of the fact of *psi*, I can hold this to be true without propounding any visible means of communication. By some such process as operates in telepathic communication between men, God can be aware of my thought and I may receive a thought from God.

That thought will not be received, or if received, not registered, unless I trust the process and allow it to function. J. B. Rhine noted, you may remember, exactly this same requirement of faith in the process in the deliberate exercise of the *psi* capacity. He also remarks how completely unconscious was the way in which *psi* operated. Moreover, “The subject was unaware of how well he was doing even when he was making long sequences of hits in perfect order. He had no introspective guide as to when a true cognitive effect took place or whether or not in any given trial he was right or wrong in the response he felt impelled to make.”

How well this accords with spiritual experience! Inward certainty is delusive. We are brought back to the Deuteronomic test, “When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken.”

In the *psi* experiments many of the responses were wrong; a definite proportion of the correct ones can be attributed to chance. Concerning the right responses, it is possible to say “Of these, a certain percentage at least are true cognitions” There is, however, as I understand it, no means by which it can be asserted of any given

response "The rightness of this one is certainly due to cognition and not to chance"

This accords with the facts of our spiritual intimations, whether they take the form of prophetic inspiration or our own personal insights and intuitions. We may believe them to be true, but however we feel about them, they must answer the practical test. It will be a longer and more difficult testing than that involving a set of cards; but if in the end there is a residuum of truth which we think must have been communicated to us, if we choose to believe that, making due allowance for lucky guesses, there is in this truth some word of God—there is nothing in the field of ascertained knowledge to assert that this cannot be. For the experience is closely parallel to the observed process of communication between human minds.

Regarding this specific instance as illustrative only, we have now reached this point concerning our doctrine; It must certainly contain the element of mystery, but the mystery must relate to fact. We must not offer complicated fancies because they seem mysterious; nor must we reject fact because it is inexplicable. If certain phenomena are demonstrable facts we may reasonably accept as fact other similar phenomena. This is in no way proved, but it becomes a reasonable item of belief, and what we reasonably believe we are reasonably entitled to teach as a belief or doctrine. Among the intimations felt in our mysterious experience of communion, there are some that come from God and their truth is therefore certain. We cannot with certainty identify them; and ideas from other sources will distort them.

Yet among the inspirations and revelations that mankind has claimed to receive, there are those that have withstood long centuries of testing and examination, argument and elaboration, defence and denial, and have survived as acceptably true. We describe them as inspired utterances. In our own humbler field there are the fleeting perceptions of moral grandeur, of ineffable beauty, of abiding joy and peace—that become driving powers in our lives, giving direction to our tastes, principles and interests. Has truth been communicated to us or have we made a lucky guess? "How likely is it for a mere guess to hit the truth?"—for the less likely it is for a guess to be right, the more likely it is that an Inspiration will be authentic.

In the *psi* experiments, with five different cards and the same number of each, the likely proportion of lucky guesses is definite—one in five, given a large number of trials. We have no such rule for determining the likelihood of lucky guesses in matters spiritual. We must form our own criteria. Genuine intimations will all relate to one coherent truth, all being derived from communion with the same Spirit. Fresh inspiration, if authentic, will be harmonious with former inspirations. The remarkable development and expansion of the ethical and spiritual elements in the Hebrew, Jewish and Christian tradition points to a long continuance of true inspiration. If we accept this, we have at least some standard of comparison for other



claims to inspiration. There is also, of course, the credibility of the person who claims to have been inspired. The Deuteronomic test, you will remember, was for the detection of a false prophet. Having once found him out, "thou shalt not be afraid of him." By implication, the prophet who has once spoken truly is the more to be trusted on another occasion.

Now if we accept it, that the Divine spirit and our own spirit are both in some way transcendent, if spirit communicates and unites with spirit in ways that transcend the physical universe, then surely we may reasonably hold that the subject matter of their communications may also transcend the physical universe—and indeed be related to facts that the scientists ignore in choosing the symbols by which they describe the universe. Among such facts are surely to be found the values of goodness, truth and beauty. I would describe an absolute value as something that matters to, and has worth for, God. And therefore, in so far as it comes within human apprehension, matters to man and has worth for him. Whether fresh intuitions of truth are themselves communicated as inspirations, or whether devotion to and search for truth is itself inspiration by the Spirit of Truth, hardly seems to matter. Whatever the mode of inspiration, it is in the field of values that we find everything we regard as inspired. This inspiration always has an energising force, impelling the enquiring mind to discover what is true, the saintly soul to achieve what is good, the artistic spirit to create what is beautiful.

Our doctrine of the spirit must insist on the energising quality of spiritual communion. If the Spirit is indeed as we take it, the Great Creative Spirit, then any feeling of union that carries no impulse to share in this creative activity is false. As to Einstein "the scientist's religious feeling" was "the guiding principle of his life and work", so to us the sense of communion with the Spirit, the promptings of the indwelling God, must provide the guiding principle of life and work. And our doctrine must be able to bring this down to the daily lives of ordinary people, help them to see and feel and appreciate the divine sacredness of their humble desire to live as well, as truly, as beautifully as they can and encourage them to open their spirits to finer sensitivity and fuller responsiveness. As we have already seen in another connection, the first essential for this is belief or trust in the validity of the doctrine, the actuality of spiritual experience; for on this depends the response. It is in our response to the spiritual call, the challenge, that practical religion begins. It cannot begin until the call has been heard and the challenge taken up.

I use the word challenge advisedly. For if we insist that our doctrine is an interpretation of facts which cannot be explained away, we must not ourselves engage in the explaining away of fact. Evil in the world is an ever-present, menacing fact; we must not cover it over with smooth words. If I must not explain it away, neither can I explain it.

It is so; and all I can say is that just as in my human body there

are cells which are me and not-me, so the Universe holds God and not-God. In my body not-me cells can organise themselves into a malignant growth; in the Universe not-God elements can organise themselves into malignant growths of evil. I do not know why, but it appears as fact. Active evil, harmful fortuity, seem to me utterly inexplicable and impossible in the Creation of a Perfect and Omnipotent God. But in saying what is impossible to the Omnipotent, I am only revealing that the word Omnipotent has no real meaning to me. For such reasons as this, I try to avoid abstract words of infinitude, with their logical pitfalls, and use such terms as Universal; which sufficiently conveys the idea of being without limit.

We are concerned with "What Is"—not what follows from a verbal definition. In the Universe that is, an expanding, evolving Universe, the existence of present evil is more easily acceptable than in the once-and-for-all Creation of a statistically perfect Being. I can accept its present existence and retain my religious faith on this one condition: That there is a divine Purpose that evil shall be overcome, and a divine call to me to help in the overcoming of it. L. P. Jacks, in *Religious Perplexities* sees the heroic soul asking and answering these questions: "Is the Soul of the World at one with us in these great endeavours? Does it meet us on that high level with the companionship of a Spirit akin to ours, not only asking for our loyalty, but giving it in return? If so, God exists; the universe is divine; and the world is fit for heroes to live in. Hallelujah, for the Lord reigneth! . . . This is the side of our nature which Christianity brought to light, in all its splendour and power, when it revealed us to ourselves in the person of Christ—that, in all of us, which stands above the perplexities of life and is more than a match for them; which sees evil with the clearest eye, and at the same time overcomes it with the deepest love."

Our doctrine should thus present the experience of the spirit as including an energising challenge-and-response to join together and be at one in overcoming evil with good.

For the sake of communicability, our teaching should use as little as possible of the technical language of theology or the traditional language of Christian churches. Not only are the words unknown to, or violently misunderstood by, most of our fellow countrymen but we also have, I believe, something to say to persons of other religious traditions, to whom the language of Christianity is literally a foreign tongue. On the other hand, similar views of the nature of a living organism, of the whole physical universe are now spread planet-wide, and are influencing the religious thoughts of men, producing amazing similarities. Professor Sircar, a Hindu, is speaking: "The Universe is a Divine Being. We are parts of one stupendous whole, Whose body nature is, and God the Soul. Prayer is the true guide to the living mysteries of the universe, for it is reception and response, and owing to its delicate sensitiveness the psychic being is able to feel and respond to the radiant, beneficent

forces at work in the heart of creation. It inspires service in reverence and awe. It vouchsafes a bliss which no satiation of desire can give, and a satisfaction that no human success can procure. And it shifts the centre of man's being, till he feels within himself the presence and power of the cosmic urge. True prayer is thus the saturation of our being with the spirit of God, the Holy Spirit descends into our spirit. And the finest fruit of prayer is the awakening of our super-consciousness—the consciousness of divine kinship and likeness to God.”

And here is a Muslim monk, who has begun by reminding his hearers that his words are reaching them through the medium of sound-waves: “We find the world around us by sensible organs, but within and underlying it there runs a current of spirit. As our eyes are organs for sight, and our ears for hearing, so each one of us has an organ for God. And when we realise that our duty lies in developing that capacity we realise our true selves, we realise God, and inner and outer become one.”

What these two passages would have meant to me if they had been put in the specialised terms of Hinduism and Islam I do not know—but I doubt if I should have found them coming so close to my own mind. In our own exposition we must be alive to this consideration—we must not by our words make our thought unintelligible to those who would otherwise welcome it. To *unintelligible* I would even add *repellent*, for many lapsed Christians are in a state of violent revulsion from the tenets of their former church. They may shy away even from the word God because it has, for them, no other meaning than an incredible mixture of an old man, a child and a ghost. Yet they retain an outlook that is essentially theistic. It is to such as these that we must make ourselves comprehensible. We may in the end teach them to speak and understand our language; but first we must be able to speak theirs.

**Frederick J. Hamblin**, Minister of the Old Meeting House, Coseley, Staffs., has contributed twice before to this Journal: “Speaking with authority yet Free”, in Vol. 7, Pt. 1, and “The God of Worship”, in Vol. 11, Pt. 1.



# *The Psychological Background of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*

C. H. BARTLETT

THE term, "the Holy Spirit", is most generally used in Unitarian Churches as an alternative term for "the Indwelling God," and it will be used in this paper in that sense, and without therefore implying any doctrine of the Trinity. The typical Unitarian position, as the writer understands it, is most clearly expressed in the familiar words of Eliza Scudder's hymn:—

" Yet high above the limits of my seeing,  
And folded far within the inmost heart,  
And deep below the deeps of conscious being,  
Thy splendour shineth: there, O God, Thou art! "

A psychological study of this doctrine might be an attempt to show how and why such a doctrine had arisen in the light of the theories and tests of some modern school of psychology. But since modern psychology is a confusing welter of conflicting opinions, such a study would have no particular value. It is too often forgotten by those who make statements on behalf of modern psychology in critical, and often antagonistic, assessment of old ideas, that the subject is still in the pre-scientific state of intense and serious research, a world in which there are no firm foundations of agreed terms and theories, and in which very often there is no agreement as to what are the facts to be examined, and in which 'one man's meat is another man's poison.' No pronouncement on the doctrine would therefore have any validity except as a statement as to what one person belonging to one particular school in psychology thought of it.

It has therefore seemed better that we should consider whether the independent researches of the modern psychologists, starting from points of view so entirely different from the older religious thinkers, have thrown up any theories which are parallel to the doctrine of "the indwelling God", or which can be related to it. Our conclusion is that Christian theologians in their study of human nature, and modern psychologists in their study of mental disorder, are far closer together than would appear from the superficial words used. Any adequate demonstration of this would require a lengthy thesis. I shall be content to suggest that this argument is worth much more detailed study and serious consideration.

The theme of this paper therefore is the statement: "There are parallels which can be drawn, without violation to either side,

between the religious theory known as the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and certain theories developed by those schools in modern psychology which now are generally classed together as 'depth-psychology', namely, the schools of Freud and Jung." To this I add the further statement: "It is the religious doctrine which gives the most adequate foundation to the theories of the depth-psychologists and the clearest explanation of their experience."

And what is the religious doctrine? It is that the human organism is ultimately a duality, not the so-called Cartesian duality of body and mind, but the duality of God and Man as essential but independent factors in the total human organism. There is, on the one hand, what modern jargon would term the Ego-system, with its intelligent power to understand and its conative power to exert effort, with its whole range of unconscious factors, both in the form of motives not consciously appreciated, and in the form of external influences of which the person may not be aware but which nevertheless are acting continually in an autonomous manner to control his overt behaviour; and there is on the other hand what is affirmed in the familiar lines already quoted.

And the "Thou" of the last line is separate in purpose and in its power to exert willed action. There is the will of man and there is the will of God. Any other interpretation of the doctrine, which evades the objectivity of that THOU and converts it into some subjective element of the individual human mind, is a complete evasion of all the familiar language of the Christian religion, and indeed of other religions also, especially those of the Eastern cultures. This other-than-human entity, which is fundamental to the duality of the human organism, is already a familiar notion in Augustine and runs through the whole of orthodox Christian theology, turning up in *Theology for Beginners* by F. J. Sheed, published only recently, as when that author says: "Everything whatsoever receives the energy of God, bringing it into existence and keeping it there; that is the sense in which God is omnipresent, is everywhere, in everything," . . . an echo in the present of the great Pauline phrases about the "God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all." It is the doctrine which is at the root of the controversy as to the nature of Christ which was partially settled by the *Tome* of Leo and the Chalcedonic Definition, and which nevertheless had to await the full solution of the Monothelite and Monophysite controversies before the essential duality of the one organism was acceptable to Western reason even in the case of Christ. That settlement looks back to Jesus himself and such mysterious phrases as "I and the Father are one," in which the clear distinction between the two elements is there for all to see, and good theologians have not been blind, as the same distinction in the Athanasian creed testifies, though it is a distinction which unhappily in popular teaching has been blurred from the very first debates right up to the latest preacher who heretically states "Jesus is God."

The doctrine has never in sound theology separated Christ from the normal human personality in this respect, for the two elements which are in united harmony in the Christ are also in the normal man, though split off the one from the other as an inevitable consequence of the Fall. Christian pastoral teaching, in its most authoritative form, has always been concerned with the re-union, or as it has come to be called, the Sacred Marriage, between these two separated elements of the human organism. Christianity in its orthodox doctrine, is to use modern terminology, concerned with the problem of a basic schizophrenia which lies at the root of all human ills, and each of its techniques, either through the services of the church or through personal training in sanctity, is aimed at the dissolution of that split condition. The language and manner of life of such great mystics as St. John of the Cross, or his friend, Santa Teresa, cannot really be understood apart from that concept. Indeed, it would not perhaps be too much to say that the whole of the great monastic system of the Christian West would have no intelligible *raison d'être*, were it not for that fundamental idea and that purpose.

It is astonishing to find that a modern neurologist turned psychotherapist, and not a Christian but a Jew, soaked in Judaism and unfamiliar with Christianity, has been driven by his clinical experience of mentally abnormal patients to a similar doctrine. Sigmund Freud, seeking to find some rational system of ideas by which to interpret the phenomena of neurosis and psychosis, began first by assuming that these abnormalities of mental functioning arose from conflict between those things of memory, impulse or idea which were acceptable to the person and those things in the person's mind which were not acceptable and which were therefore repressed into some level of the mind in which they could be conveniently forgotten. At that stage, the only things which Freud recognised as basic elements of the human mind were (1) the organised rational mind of waking consciousness with its standards of judgement, and (2) a kind of general rag-bag or limbo of the rejected material of life experience which consciousness refused to assimilate. This proved quite inadequate as a theory, particularly in respect of the genuinely insane states of the psychotic. Freud then was driven to his doctrine of the Ego and the Id, first published in German in 1923 in the book, *Das Ich und Das Es*. This book marked a turning point in Freud's theoretical views. It presents a hypothetical picture of the anatomy of the mind, and lays stress on mental structure as compared with mental function. By the 'ego' Freud meant all that can be considered as the functioning of the human will and human intelligence, together with all the individual's life experience, whether available to consciousness or completely repressed. He visualised this, however, as only part of the fundamental story of the human mind. There was also, he conceived, another part which was completely independent of the ego-system in all its ramifications. This other



part was a reservoir of life-potentiality, struggling (and it is important to realise that Freud thought of it as intensely active) for expression through the life of the person and continually frustrated in its effort by the limitations of the individual. This he named the *Id* . . . or perhaps it is better to keep the ordinary German of the original, *Das Es* . . . the IT. Freud deliberately chose such an almost meaningless word because for him *das Es* was unknowable in its nature, that is, completely unconscious . . . and destined by its very nature as potentiality to remain unknown. Freud's attitude to the *Id* might, I think, at the risk of appearing to pervert a phrase, be best expressed, so far as he intellectually and emotionally thought of it, as "The Fountain of Life for ever striving to flow free." The writer of the hymn understood the Fountain of Life to contain, not only power and the whole range of normal life potentiality, but also the full force of the most perfect striving after truth, beauty and goodness. Freud stopped short of the latter, thinking of it as more a fountain of wild, chaotic life, whose denial was a danger for human stability but which must be controlled by the human ego for the safety of the human personality. But he is at one with the Christian theologian in visualising that the human organism is a duality in which there is the human element and also another and separate entity of immense power. Like the theologian too, he was thinking in terms of spiritual entities (though he would have used the modern term "psychological," meaning the same thing). He refused at all times to have anything to do with the attempt to reduce such terms to mere physical things or functions of the physical. It is an utter misinterpretation of Freud to conceive of him as a materialist, though he did sometimes speculate as to whether the force of the *Id* was derived from physical roots, but only as one of his less serious bright ideas. To those who are familiar with D. H. Lawrence, it may be interesting to notice that his vision of human nature is almost exactly the same as the later conception of Freud, especially in such writings as *The Plumed Serpent*, *The Fantasia of the Unconscious*, and that amazingly useful little essay (useful to the theoretical psychologist), *The Crown* . . . though Freud would probably have said of Lawrence that he would have been wiser to have been more afraid of the life-power.

For Freud, as for the Christian theologian, the distresses of human life, in so far as they are attributable to human fault, are in the end due to a fundamental split, a fundamental schizophrenia. Where the Christian speaks of the Fall by which the human became separated off from the indwelling Divine, Freud speaks of the prime, prehistoric trauma by which the socialised *Ego* became split off from the *Id*. It is curious that in both cases the cause is found at the beginning of history, in the one case in the Garden of Eden, in the other case in the primeval horde of almost animal man. Moreover, the two theories are parallel in another way, namely, that they both accept the paradox that the human self, though completely separated

from that other source of life and power within, nevertheless in each individual arises out of it. The *Ego* for Freud arises out of the *Id* and in some sense remains a function of it, though taking on its own independent life, and even dangerously opposing the very source of its own existence . . . and for the Christian, the very soul which can so completely oppose its God is nevertheless the son of that God and born of him and in his own image.

It is when we turn to Freud's disciple, for many years his trusted fellow-worker, though in the end his reluctant opponent, the Swiss psychiatrist, Jung, that we find this Freudian doctrine of the *Ego* and the *Id* developing a stage nearer to the characteristic Christian doctrine. Jung begins from the same point of view, though using a different term. What Freud calls the *Id*, Jung renames the Collective Unconscious, not because he is referring to any different element in theory but because of a different interpretation of the content of that element. Where Freud insists that that Other in the human organism is only a source of elementary life, of what Bernard Shaw might have been content to call The Life Force, Jung replies that it can be shown to contain other and more fundamental elements, and he wrote his book *The Integration of the Personality* to argue this point. For Jung, what the (putting all the terms together) "Fountain of Life-Id-Collective Unconscious" contained at bottom was not just blind life forces, but organising, integrating functions and purposes, which were concerned, not just to gain the satisfaction of the free flow of libido, that is, of life potentiality, but which were more importantly concerned with the up-building of a satisfactory, balanced and integrated personality. This, Jung, in the book I have mentioned, attempted to demonstrate by drawing attention to certain characteristic symbols which the process of dreaming tended to throw up in the course of establishing an integrated stability in a neurotic patient. These symbols were mainly circles, squares and associated figures and movements. In his patient's dream material Jung thinks that he discerns the signs of an integrating factor, quite other than the conscious effort of his patient, which is concerned for the spiritual and moral welfare of the person in all aspects of his life . . . an integrating factor moreover which can be completely trusted to take control of the process of cure and, more importantly, of the whole process of life-development as it is appropriate to the person's own nature and his environmental circumstances. Where Freud finds the fundamental source of neurosis in our failure to find adequate outlet for the *Id*, the reservoir of life-potentiality, Jung finds the fundamental source of neurosis in our failure to co-operate adequately with the central integrating factor. In both cases the failure is the result of the conditioning factors of society imposing upon us ideas which are inadequate to the satisfactory adjustment of a personality to the mysterious depths of its own nature, depths which, in dreams, tend to reveal themselves as oceans from which too often the dreamer shrinks in fear.

The basic problem of psychotherapy then becomes a matter of breaking the hold of external influences, both of the past as they still function effectively in the person, even if unconsciously, and of the present as they impinge upon the person in his day-to-day living, and then to accustom him to learn to depend upon something in himself which is not his own will. Here, modern depth-psychology, as it has been developed by these medical men, concerned at first only with the problems of treating mental disorder, comes amazingly close to the whole traditional scheme of the cure of souls as it grew up in the contemplative tradition of Christian orthodoxy.

I turn therefore to consider what that scheme was. It is entirely wrong to assume that there was no systematic psychology before the end of the last century. It is perhaps true that there has been no secular systematic psychology. It is perhaps true that post-reformation Protestantism has had, and still has, no systematic psychology. But classical Christian theology has a very clear and very simple psychological system, which is still capable of wide application and still immensely useful. One of the *loci classici* for its expression is in that profound and subtle Middle English book, *The Cloud of Unknowing* . . . where the author, in chapter 62, says, "Within thyself in nature be the powers of thy soul, the which be these three principal: Mind, Reason and Will; and secondary. Imagination and Sensuality. Above thyself in nature is no manner of thing, but only God." Some 200 years later Augustine Baker, the English Benedictine contemplative director, notes that other authors use the term "memory" where *The Cloud* says "Mind", and "Understanding" where it says "Reason". And this can be paralleled again and again with different authors using different terms but speaking as if they were completely familiar with what each writer meant. Indeed, beginning with Augustine the church was accustomed to think of human psychology in terms, first, of the soul or, as we should say, the *ego*, and then in terms of three superior functions and two inferior functions. This scheme first, I think, appears in Augustine's *De Trinitate*, though it is present already in embryo in his *Confessions*, particularly in the tenth book. It is echoed with approval nine centuries later by Aquinas in the *De Veritate*, and is fundamental to medieval thinking about human nature, and is still the psychological scheme which is taught in the Roman Catholic Church. The three superior functions of the soul are what we should now call Consciousness, Intelligence and Conation . . . or perhaps better, Consciousness, Reason and Will. The two inferior functions of (to use the medieval Latin) *imaginatio* and *sensualitas* we cannot translate by their English cognates since *imaginatio* means much more than the modern Imagination, and the modern Sensuality has almost next to nothing to do with *sensualitas*. *Sensualitas* is what we might best term "the world of sense-impression", and is a very broad term that covers all that range of experience, attraction and distraction, which is externally orientated and which comes to us through our senses,



and which has such a complete hold over our minds that we consider it is the world of reality *par excellence*. Medieval Christian orthodoxy and modern philosophy are agreed that this is the only source of our knowledge in so far as our knowledge is natural knowledge. The modern philosopher knows no other knowledge that is trustworthy. The medieval theologian, in agreement with Plato, thought there was another source of knowledge, though disagreed with Plato as to the nature of the source. Where Plato said, "Memory that is lost," the Christian said "God." If therefore the Christian wished to get into touch and ultimately to be in union with his God, he must first break the hold upon himself of the whole world of sense-impression, as well as all the impulses which directed him to value that world at (according to the doctrine) too high a value. In this the Christian is entirely at one with the Hindu teaching of the Upanishads and Bhagavadgita, as well as with the teaching of Buddhism. And in this ascetic process a critical stage should appear in which all concern for the external world had been lost, all interest in normal action had disappeared, and living, at any rate so far as the normal pattern of external reality was concerned, had lost its savour. To this state, distressing for the person in it and worrying for those ordinary folk who observed the man in it, St. John of the Cross gave the term which has now become almost a standard term, 'The Dark Night of the Senses.' His interpretation of this state has been accepted by Orthodoxy as correct; it is due to the action of the Indwelling God withdrawing the soul from its absorption in external reality. Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* begins with a very vivid description of such a state, and very beautifully and sympathetically makes it clear that, to ordinary people round about Christian, he seemed merely to have lost his wits . . . "His relations were sore amazed because they thought that some frenzy distemper had got into his head . . . therefore it drawing towards night, and they thinking that sleep might settle his brains, with all haste they got him to bed." But what seemed to Christian's relations merely "a distemper to be driven away by harsh and surly carriages to him" was, as we know, the beginning of his profound spiritual adventure. All this may seem remote from Freudian psychoanalysis or from Jungian analytical psychology, but in fact that is not so. A collapse of interest in normal routines, a nervous breakdown as such states are popularly called, a loss of appetite for living, is not a mere disorder to be cured but, on the contrary, the beginning of an internal process concerned for the further spiritual development of the individual. It is at this point that the most violent disagreement arises between the typical medical psychiatrist and the Freudian or Jungian. The former regards the so-called normal state of the person as perfectly right and proper and completely healthy, and the abnormal state of severe loss of interest as a disorder to be cured so that the person can get back to normal. The psychotherapist of the other two schools regards the collapse as the sign that the supposedly normal condition of the person previously

was in fact completely unsatisfactory, and the collapse is the opportunity produced by internal factors for the person to go on to a new level of spiritual experience. Therefore, "To get back to what I was before" is a false cure in which the spiritual opportunity has been lost. So it is quite possible for a psychoanalyst to be able to say quite sincerely, "O yes! he's cured . . . unfortunately . . . and we shall now have to wait perhaps for another ten years before we get another opportunity to tackle the job properly." If one knows a case in detail from the inside, it sometimes seems quite unbelievable that people can be saying, "How nice that so-and-so has been cured," when in fact nothing of any importance has been done at all.

This conviction that mental disturbance of any kind (other than the genuinely insane psychotic cases which are usually easily distinguished by the fact that the person has no sense that there is anything wrong with him) is a demand by internal factors for further spiritual growth, is at the core of the Freudian technique of treatment by free association, the so-called sofa-technique, which is all aimed at giving those internal factors their opportunity for influence over the mind. The patient is asked to remove his attention from the external world as far as possible, and also to get rid of all willed control over the flow of his mind and his tongue. He must learn to let himself just drift on an uncontrolled tide of wandering thought . . . for the length of the analytical session. And the extraordinary thing is that it works. I am not going to suggest that it works every time, far from it, but on the other hand, it works sufficiently effectively and sufficiently often that more and more medical psychiatrists over the years have turned to it as their salvation, and the Freudian International Association is growing in numbers and in influence every year.

What I have said may sound all very simple and easy to do, both for the patient and for the analyst. In fact, it doesn't work out like that at all. Each and every patient puts up complicated resistances to the whole process. He fights to stop his mind from running easily and without control. He becomes terrified the moment it seems to be out of control. He tries to convert the whole business into one of simply getting back to what he was before he collapsed. So many and diverse are the resistances to this apparently easy process that it is nowadays said in psychoanalytic teaching that the whole of psychoanalysis consists of "working through the resistances." And one is again and again reminded vividly of that phrase in our *Orders of Worship*, "Lay to rest, by the persuasion of thy Spirit, the resistance of our passion, indolence or fear." And that is not inappropriate, because here again is a parallel between Christian teaching and the psychotherapist. Both have trust in internal factors at work for the welfare of the individual. Both teach that the exercise of the human will, at least in certain fundamental spiritual issues, is of no avail, so far as the welfare of the individual is concerned. "Of myself I can do nothing" . . . that is the rule for the mental case as it is for the saint.

Both Christian theologian and Freudian psychotherapist seek to train those under them to relax and to let themselves be carried by an unconscious process. Both know the unending resistance that the human *ego* puts up against this. Both know how evil a thing the human, wilful pride can be which is determined at all cost to keep its control over its own life and mind. Jung has a lengthy passage in the *Integration* in which he makes the note that this poses a most difficult problem for our minds. "It would appear that there is nothing so distressing or repugnant for the Western mind as becoming the passive object of the action of interior forces. Yet this is the only way whereby lasting spiritual gains may be made. Except ye become as little children, surrendered to the inner processes of growth, ye shall in no wise inherit the kingdom of your spirit."

To return to the orthodox Christian psychological scheme of the three superior capacities of the soul, Consciousness, Reason and Will, and the two inferior capacities, Imagination and *sensualitas*. I have argued that the depth-psychologist takes the same attitude as the director of religious souls in the medieval contemplative tradition over the matters of the Will and the world of sense-impression, *sensualitas*. There are also parallels with the other orthodox functions. To both the Freudian and the orthodox theologian the supreme human capacity is Reason, Intelligent Understanding—all that is assumed in the Latin term, *Ratio*. And here the Unitarian should have welcomed eagerly Freudian psychoanalysis, for it is one of those systems of thought which, like the Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius, almost deify human reason. It is odd that this has often not been noticed by people who read Freud's books. They often get the impression that Freud is teaching sexual license or the free release of primitive passion or the complete breakdown of all manners and all morals. They forget that whatever Freud *said*, he was concerned from beginning to end with nothing except the salvation of the reason of his patients. Moreover the whole process of psychoanalysis has another side to it which is equally fundamental, namely, that there must be a continual effort on the part of the patient in co-operation with the analyst to understand what had happened to make the patient what he is and to understand what is happening in the process of the treatment. Moreover, the so-called "dummy" attitude of the psychoanalyst is an attempt to leave the patient's reason free to come to its own conclusions and decisions about the person's life and to find its own direction. Jung secures the same aim by basing all argument, so far as it is humanly possible, upon the patient's own material, whether of his life history or his dreams. And that leads to the further comment that Freud and Jung have returned unwittingly to that fundamental principle shared by Socrates and classical Christianity, that "self-knowledge" is a fundamental factor in spiritual development. The medieval tag of the contemplative, *nosce teipsum*, might also be the basic text of the psychotherapist.



But if Freud and Jung have been driven by their practical experience of dealing deeply with human nature to points of view similar to those of the Christian doctrine, why have they not become out and out supporters of religion? For Jung has been hesitant in his support of the Christian religion and Freud quite violently antagonistic to Christianity and to Judaism as well. The answer is that neither had any training in religious thinking. Both were first and foremost doctors, concerned with medical patients. They were experimenters in a field of medicine little understood and not at all popular with the run of medical men. They fashioned their theories as they went along and had no contacts in their formative years with very much outside their medical schools to help them in their theories. Freud also, as the result of a personal kink of his own character, and perhaps partly as the result of an inner rebellion against a strict religious background in his own family, never had any positive interest in religion. His attention was directed towards religion by an understandable but unfortunate influence, namely, that he found again and again in his patients that the neurotic conditions he was called upon to treat had a great deal to do with an overstrict, puritanical upbringing, supported by a religion of fear. He set himself to free his patients, and the world, of such a religion, failing to realise that what he was attacking was a perversion of Christianity, which perhaps Jesus himself would have been the first to attack. But oddly enough, although he attacked religion and endeavoured to explain away God as merely an inflated and cosmically projected Father image, he produced, and psychoanalysis has accepted generally, something remarkably like this doctrine of the Indwelling Holy Spirit. You might read Freudian literature quite a lot before you began to tumble to the fact that the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit, rejected at the front door along with all other Christian doctrine, turns up again at the backdoor and gets settled quite solidly in the house as *EROS*.

Freud has an odd doctrine of what he calls "Instincts" . . . and those of you who know McDougall (and any other psychologists who have speculated about instinct in man or animal) must forget all you've read, because Freud's Instincts are quite unlike anything else of the same name. To Freud there are two basic instincts, *Eros*, the instinct for creation, and *Thanatos*, the death-instinct. With the latter we are not concerned here. It has gained popular notoriety but has never been accepted by the Freudian psychoanalysts as anything but an oddity of Freud's quite frequently wild speculations. Even Freud grew to be unsure as to whether it really was a valuable idea. Ernest Jones, in his biography of Freud, wrote that he knew no modern psychoanalyst who accepted the idea. So there is but one instinct. But the word instinct is used by Freud in the sense of formative factor. For Freud it is not I who possess instinct or instincts, but rather the instinct which possesses me, in the sense that

it controls my growth and development. *Eros* therefore is the creative factor which controls the growth and development of a man in so far as the ego-system and the pressure of external society will permit, and it is a fundamental element in the *ID*. Freud here has a contradiction in his theory, for part of the time he is arguing (and some analysts after him) that the *ID* is simply a reservoir of elementary life-force, and part of the time (in later years and probably under the unacknowledged influence of Jung) he is saying that the *ID* life-forces are not the most fundamental thing but have a substratum of this controlling creative power, the instinct *EROS*. It is when one meets the term in actual use that the closeness of this to the Holy Spirit begins to appear. *Eros*, of course, is simply the Greek word for love, and it is unfortunate that its cognate adjective, erotic, has a markedly sexual meaning in English . . . but this is completely absent from Freud's use of *Eros*. I would remind you of the use of Love in connection with God in normal religious usage, and of such a book as Julian of Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love*. I refer to that great classic of the English religious life especially in view of my next quotation. At the end of her book on *Dream Analysis*, Ella Sharpe, one of England's very best training analysts in the London Institute of Psychoanalysis, has an epilogue. She writes: "I wish to record as the final dream in this book one which was in reality a last dream, since it was related by a woman three days before her death. She did not regain full consciousness after reciting it. Physical distress had mainly been caused by persistent sickness, and her dream ran: 'I saw all my sicknesses gathered together and as I looked they were no longer sicknesses but roses and I knew the roses would be planted and that they would grow.'" After one or two comments, Miss Sharpe says: "It is *Eros* alone who *knows* that the roses will be planted and will grow."

Is this not the sort of deep spiritual vision which would be immediately recognised and understood by such a person as Thomas à Kempis as being completely at one with his own teaching of the Royal Way of the Cross in *The Imitation*, that way of patient and humble acceptance of suffering which can lead to a fulfilment of spiritual experience, a flowering of the personality? What he has said in *The Imitation* is only one expression of the general attitude of Christian orthodoxy on the subject of bearing one's cross. And would not the Christian teacher say that Man, so far as his *own* understanding goes can have only faith? Only the Holy Spirit can *know* that pain may bring spiritual fruition. And is there not here some close affinity between the professional orthodox psychoanalyst and the orthodox Christian theologian?

I would like to dwell on this dream a few minutes longer, for there are other points to be examined.

First, notice that the dreamer is asleep, that is, in ordinary language, in an unconscious state. Nevertheless, she sees and can

intelligently understand in complete consciousness, as is, of course, true of every dream. In other words, consciousness with all its range of perception and of reason is functioning in a perfectly normal manner even though the person is unconscious in some other and more superficial sense. It follows that consciousness, as the medieval church taught, is fundamental to the human personality and continues to function normally at all times. What we have to distinguish is whether that consciousness is externally orientated *per sensualitatem ad exteriora*, as Aquinas says, as in normal waking life, or whether it is internally oriented, withdrawn from the world of sense-impression, as it is in dreams, or as the mystic seeks to train himself to be, in the state of 'interior prayer'. I do not think it has been sufficiently noticed that Freud and Jung have, almost inadvertently returned to a notion of mental functioning which is quite alien to our typical modern thought, but which is perfectly familiar to the teachers of the contemplative tradition in Christianity, as it is also to their mystical colleagues, if I may call them such, in the Eastern religions. In fact, as we approach the deeper levels of dream-material, to which this dream belongs, and which it would appear every person can approach as and when he is prepared to spend time and energy on the effort to understand his dreams, we are in a world thoroughly familiar to the Christian teacher, both as to the spiritual content of what can only at this stage be called religious visions and as to the psychological notions of the anatomy of mind. We are in the world in which the language of Julian of Norwich, *The Cloud of Unknowing* and Thomas à Kempis and the ideas of the strict psychoanalyst cohere together into a unity. The visionary material of Christ at the Baptism or in the Temptations, the dreams of Peter in the book of *Acts*, the sense of a commanding voice as it came to Old Testament prophet or to Muhammed or to Joan of Arc no longer appear strange and abnormal but fit into a systematic psychological scheme which can be and is in practice applied to the study of the dream material of the neurotic patient in the consulting room.

I have omitted one term so far of the orthodox Christian scheme, namely, *imaginatio*. This term is used to denote the whole range of the imagery which belongs to our human experience, whether it is the imagery which is cast up by our interaction with sense-impression or the imagery which, unrelated, at any rate directly, to the immediate impact of sense stimuli, functions apparently without any control on our own part in the world of hallucination or dream or vision. What we call now 'Imagination' is only a minute part of this whole inner world of *imaginatio*. This the analyst treats as full of meaning and purpose. I have noted this attitude in the Freudian, Ella Sharpe, whom I have quoted. The attitude is even more impressively there in Jung, as anybody can see quickly if he reads *The Integration of the Personality*. And this again is the return in modern times of an older



religious point of view. The typical modern mind tends to regard the inner imagery as without value, unless it can be excused on the ground of poetry. It cannot conceive of it as having objective reality on any ground whatsoever, so that, for example, the vision of the transfigured Christ in the Gospels can be treated by the Catholic theologian as an experience of reality though not the reality of external physical fact, whereas the modern mind can only treat such things as mere hallucinations or as poetry, lacking any objective reality. Jung by contrast has insisted on the objective *psyche* and the objective reality of psychic imagery. He is repeating what has been stated in other words in the form:—

“Two worlds are ours, 'tis only sin (the psychotherapist would prefer to say, repression) which forbids us to descry the mystic heaven and earth within.”

And over this other world of objective imagery within, both the director of spiritual souls concerned with the union with God and the psychotherapist take the attitude that it is limiting and unwise to be over-impressed with the inner imagery, even if it throws up the most moving and numinous material. The psychoanalyst and the analytical psychologist are concerned to translate the imagery into intelligible rational thought. The medieval contemplative was taught never to remain content with sensible imagery however majestic and profound but to press on in his search for God, remembering, as Augustine taught, that God is most nearly to be approached, *non per sensibilia sed per intelligibilia*. It would be perhaps wise if some moderns who are stressing the importance of feeling and sensuous imagery in religion were to remember the older and deeper teaching which is so much more in line with the practice of the modern psychotherapist.

I cannot for a moment imagine that I have *proved* a closeness of thought between the members of modern psychological therapeutic schools and the older religious schools of spiritual training in the Christian church. The only possible way of doing that would be to take some writer such as Louis de Blois in *A Book of Spiritual Instruction*, or St. John of the Cross in *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*, or even the familiar language of our own prayer book and hymn book and show point by point that the teaching of the psychotherapist is so exactly parallel that it is quite possible to take a patient through a whole course of treatment without any quotation whatsoever except from common religious language. I have only sought to suggest that some modern medical men seem to have come, by a different route, remarkably close to the whole nexus of thought to which the doctrine of the Indwelling God belongs.

It is when one swings over completely to the religious point of view that one discovers that nothing so simply draws together into one system of ideas such a vast range of facts. The dreams of a patient in all their subtle range of symbolism, the language and

experience of the prophet and the mystic, the visionary material of the Bible or of such a person as the Julian of Norwich are all seen to fall together into one simple pattern, the variations being explicable also in simple terms of a limited number of variant factors. The matter becomes even more exciting when it is observed that one has now a theory by which the physical concomitants of spiritual experience, as for example the ocular dissociation of St. Paul on the road to Damascus (quite improperly dismissed by Schweitzer as mere epileptic formation) or the migraine symptoms of the disciples at the first Pentecost are seen to cohere with those physical experiences of patients undergoing treatment which are known to be the physical characteristics of deep spiritual change . . . so again the familiar stories of the religious life become embodied in a theory which is amenable to experimental test in the analytic consulting room.

But this poses a very critical problem, upon which already psychiatrists and psychotherapists have passed influential comment, and upon which it is of vital importance that religious thinkers should do some careful and detailed research: there is quite obviously, and this is, I think, agreed by all workers in the field, to whatever school they belong, a very close relationship between the mental and physical experiences that belong to the religious life and the experiences that belong to neurotic collapse. Are we, as did Max Nordau in the case of Santa Teresa as he studied her in his *Degeneration* or as a French psychiatrist has made out more widely in the book *La Religion d'après les Maladies Mentales*, to interpret the characteristics of religious genius as merely the symptoms of morbid psychology due to general mental degeneration, or are we to interpret neurotic disturbance in the light of religious experience as the mark of the surface waters being troubled by the Holy Spirit? This is the great debate in modern psychology, as it was the great debate between Bunyan's Christian and his family at the beginning of *Pilgrim's Progress*.

**Charles H. Bartlett, B.A.** (Liverpool), was trained for the Ministry at Manchester College, Oxford (1929-32). He has held ministries at Hackney (London), Rotterdam, Hinckley, and at Stalybridge, Lancs., since 1952.



## A Review of "Closed Ranks"—

An Experiment in Mental Health Education, by Elaine and John Cumming, for the Commonwealth Fund, Harvard Univ. Press, 1957

Reviewed by PAUL E. KILLINGER

THIS book deserves two reviews! One because of its implications for the theory and practice of Unitarianism, and another because of the light it sheds on the whole area of mental health education in which many Unitarians are so interested.

*Closed Ranks* is a study of a mental health education project in one of Canada's Prairie provinces. The town studied is given the name Blackfoot and is an over-organized, ingrown community, founded threequarters of a century ago. This is a most unusual study because it reviews and evaluates a project that failed.

Written by a husband and wife team who are psychiatrist and sociologist respectively this book analyzes some of the fallacious assumptions underlying "... an attempt ... to change a community's attitude toward mental illness—from what we supposed were bad attitudes to what we defined as good ones." While the Cummings apply their conclusions to the field of mental health education, the implications for Unitarian efforts at education and attitude changing are many and provocative.

The committee that planned the study and educational program in Blackfoot made a number of assumptions based on their professional experience. The results of the evaluation study showed that the assumptions of the professional planners of the program were unwarranted. The implication for Unitarians seems to me that professional program planners are not always the proper people to plan an educational program that will actually reach people.

A more specific assumption that was made in planning the program was that small discussion groups would handle the anxiety produced by the educational efforts. For some people making the transition to Unitarianism from other backgrounds there is also anxiety, produced in much the same way, i.e. by being challenged by a new set of values. Unitarians often act as though this anxiety can be handled by the small group discussion method. The anxiety produced by the effort at mental health education was not successfully handled by the discussion groups that were set up for the purpose. Perhaps the parallel to the discussions in Unitarian Churches is strained, but the warning is nevertheless evident.

Another problem revealed by this study is that there is a tendency to reach the middle and upper classes; this tendency is implicit both in the assumptions behind the material and in its formulation. The same tendency is evident within Unitarianism today and many



of our assumptions and formulations are not now even beginning to be examined. It is of further interest to us that *Closed Ranks* shows that person's attitudes in these classes are more easily polarized either to support or reject such an educational effort, but that active participation is not implied by an attitude of support.

But perhaps the most striking finding of this study of interest to Unitarians is that the concept of maturity has little solid support in the public understanding. More and more liberals have been broadening their idea of spiritual and intellectual growth to include the idea of the parallel growth towards emotional maturity. But this study shows, as the authors put it, that Pavlov has had more effect on the general population than has Freud! They mean that the fundamentally psychiatric idea of man's ability to grow up to the point where compulsions, feelings of being persecuted or of being inferior, are outgrown, is not accepted or widely understood by most people. Unless a person's behaviour is obviously anti-social, the general public does not define him as in need of psychiatric help. The authors say that, in the lay person's definition of normality and abnormality "the lay person uses normative or moral standards to reach the same conclusion" as the professional reaches on grounds of analysis of symptoms. The tendency to judge people in terms of right and wrong social behaviour, instead of in terms of how mature is their outlook and adjustment presents a real challenge to religious liberals. The concept of growth, of the desirability of attaining spiritual, emotional and intellectual maturity has a long way to go before its meaning is widely grasped.

The basic challenge of this book to Unitarians is its self-criticism, its implication that we must rethink the meaning and acceptance of the concept of maturity and finally, as the Cummings say at the end of their book, that "our most important practical insight has been that there is nothing so practical as a good theory."

**Paul E. Killinger** prepared for the Unitarian Ministry at the University of Buffalo 1946-9, and at Harvard University S.T.B. 1953. He is now Minister of the Unitarian Fellowship at Bloomington, Indiana; previously of Stow, Mass.